

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Teacher's Scrapbook	Grace L. Beede	97
Pinocchio Is Put to School	Vincent Vasey, S.M.	97
Latin for Fun	Harriet L. Malone	98
High School Latin and the Broadening Background	Molly B. T. Coyle	98
Bread-wrapper Palindrome	Margaret Ihlenfeldt	100
Bacchus As Inspirer of Literary Art	Arthur Patch McKinlay	101
Origins of the Word "Epyllion"	John F. Reilly	111
Lucretian Reflections	Russel M. Geer	114
Turgenev As a Student of the Classics	Chauncey E. Finch	117
"We See By the Papers"	John F. Latimer	122 <i>et passim</i>
The Distribution of Rôles in Plautus' <i>Menaechmi</i>	Paul G. Moorhead	123
The Phaedra Myth in France	Ruth Mulhauser	127
<i>Dicenda Tacenda</i>	The Editor	131
St. Augustine and the Twentieth Century	George Sanderlin	132
The Review Cupboard	Grundy Steiner	137
Two Books on Aristotle	Victor Coutant	137
<i>Lands Beyond</i>	Harris L. Russell	140
Book Reviews		
<i>Homer and the Monuments</i> (Lorimer)	George E. Mylonas	142
<i>Principium Sapientiae</i> (Cornford)	Frederick M. Combellack	143
<i>Senilis Amor</i> (Mills)	Harry E. Wedeck	144

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief: CLYDE MURLEY, Northwestern University.

Managing Editor: D. HERBERT ABEL, Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago.

Book Reviews, Review Cupboard: GRUNDY STEINER, Northwestern University.

For Secondary Schools, GRACE L. BEEDE, University of South Dakota.

"Notes": OSCAR E. NYBAKKEN, State University of Iowa.

"Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals": WILLIAM C. GRUMMEL, University of Washington.

"We See by the Papers": JOHN F. LATIMER, 706 20th St., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

For the Atlantic States: FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS, Pennsylvania State College.

For New England: JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS, Trinity College.

For the Pacific States: W. M. GREEN, University of California.

Associate Editors: GEORGE E. LANE, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.; FRANKLIN H. POTTER, State University of Iowa; F. STUART CRAWFORD, Boston University; EUGENE MILLER, University of Pittsburgh.

CORRESPONDENCE

Address all general editorial correspondence, MSS etc. to CLYDE MURLEY, 629 Noyes St., Evanston 16, Ill.; departmental materials to the proper editors listed above; MSS from the Atlantic, New England, and

Pacific States to the regional editors above; subscriptions and details of circulation to Sec'y-Treas. JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellem Hall, University of Colorado, Boulder; advertising and other business items to Mr. Abel.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The general subscription price is \$3.75 (USA), \$4.00 (foreign). Single copies 60c (USA), 65c (foreign); subscriptions for less than a year at the single copy rate. Teachers and other interested individuals may subscribe through one of the regional associations below, annual membership-subscription rate, \$3.75. Members may subscribe also to the CLASSICAL OUTLOOK and CLASSICAL WEEKLY; for rates consult the regional secretary-treasurer. Members of CAMWS and CAAS have the option of receiving either the CLASSICAL JOURNAL or CLASSICAL WEEKLY (published by CAAS).

MEMBERSHIPS

Address the Secretary-Treasurer of the appropriate regional association. CAMWS, JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellem Hall, University of Colorado, Boulder. CANE, CLAUDE W. BARLOW, Clark University, Worcester 10, Mass. CAAS, EUGENE MILLER, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh 13. CAPS (Northern), MISS WINIFRED E. WETER, Seattle Pacific College, Seattle 99. (Central), E. Y. LINDSAY, Grant Union H. S., Del Paso Heights, Calif. (Southern), MRS. JANE M. INFELD, 10474 1/2 Eastbourne Ave., Los Angeles 24.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc., with the cooperation of the Classical Association of New England, the Classical Association of the Pacific States, and the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. The annual volume consists of eight issues (October through May). Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Boulder, Colo., with an additional entry at Wilmette, Ill., on September 14, 1953. Entered under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 19, 1952.

Printed by Lloyd Hollister Inc., Wilmette, Illinois, U. S. A.

Copies	1-4pp.	5-8pp.		9-12pp.	13-16pp.	Covers
25	4.40	6.00	Price	6.60	8.25	5.50
50	4.65	6.60	List	7.50	9.25	6.00
75	5.00	7.15	For	8.35	10.25	6.60
100	5.25	7.75	Reprints	9.25	11.25	7.15
Add'l 100	1.25	2.25		3.50	4.00	2.25

Reprints are made up in excerpt form without covers, unless otherwise ordered. For reprints requiring extra composition, changes in text, special cover setup, and alterations, an extra charge will be made. Order and check for reprints must accompany return galley proofs.

ve;
to
ms
ad-
Mr.

1.75
60c
ess
ch-
ay
so-
ub-
ub-
and
the
of
re-
or

ap-
WS,
sity
W.
10,
y of
rth-
ttle
Y.
aso
M.
An-

and
assi-
ates.
ond-
Ill.,
illing
rized

For
tera-
pany

THE

P

Pr
in I
the
now
tion,
of t
caus
tion
mon
Italy
a cr
be c
scho
amo
still
rema
beca
the
me t
spok
today
teach
Unit
Th

Th
it, n
scho
clear
the p
learn
dere
dear
tions
form
prese
with
the i
of ex

Bu
ican
Pino
our
Disne
publi
movi
there
dren.
know
suit
Pino
in th
throu
Maff

THE TEACHER'S SCRAPBOOK

PINOCCHIO IS PUT TO SCHOOL

PINOCCHIO is making another bid for fame in Italy. Not satisfied with his conquest of the Italian heart in its tenderest years, he now appears in a new suit, a Latin translation, to help his little friends to a mastery of their ancestral tongue. The furor he caused is demonstrated by the second edition of the Latin translation within a few months after its first appearance. Here in Italy, as in the United States, Latin is facing a crisis. Even though the crisis is not to be compared in acuteness with that in our schools, nevertheless Latin is not cultivated among the Italians as it was years ago. It still remains and probably will continue to remain the backbone of Italian education, because it mothered Italian civilization and the Italian tongue. Yet older teachers tell me that in their prime students in the liceo spoke Latin, but the very suggestion of that today would cause consternation among teachers and pupils, just as it would in the United States.

The translation has much to recommend it, not only to Italians but to American schools as well. Its usefulness in Italy is clear. The original, a classic, written in the purest Italian, is learned as our children learn nursery rhymes or the story of Cinderella. It is not only part of his language, dear to his heart for its childhood associations, but part and parcel of his moral formation. A priest once mentioned in my presence that it is an excellent catechism, with the escapades of Pinocchio furnishing the instructor with an inexhaustible source of examples and moral background.

But it may well serve a purpose in American schools also, as will be pointed out. Pinocchio, though not the intimate friend of our students, is not a total stranger. Walt Disney introduced him to the American public some years back, the songs of the movie are perpetuated on records, and there are popularizations in print for children. Yet even if Pinocchio were not unknown, he is worth meeting in his new Latin suit for the following reasons. Pinocchio or Pinoculus, as he will henceforth be known in the liceo, came by his new clothes through the generosity of Professor Enrico Maffacini of Florence. Evidently the trans-

formation of Pinocchio was not easy. The original is in a light vein and Latin is serious for everyone nowadays, both teacher and pupil. Latin has always been serious for most people even outside the classroom: it is the language of the Church and the language of science. No one would consider Latin flippant. But Latin can be light. Erasmus wrote a light Latin when he wanted. So in the Middle Ages students did not find Latin too cumbersome a straight-jacket for their affections. Then if a person goes back to the Roman dramatists he finds a living tongue, adapted even to humor, especially in the language of Plautus.

Still, a translation of *Pinocchio* is not a target that can be hit by anyone who plumes himself in Latin feathers. The author himself did not publish his work without the advice of the most competent Latin scholars, among them Msgr. A. Bacci, the Secretary of Briefs to Princes, who is known even in the United States.

Professor Maffacini hit upon the language of Plautus and Terence, of Ovid and Apuleius, and for the most part his choice is most happy. Plautus, for example, an ex-slave, knew and used the racy Latin of the people and created a style well adapted to the levity of Pinocchio. If the translator had failed, we would have had a pompous Latin and an incongruity such as Oliver Goldsmith foresaw if Sam Johnson had written a fable. After Sam's devastating remark on the triviality of the work involved in an animal story, a sort of Walt Disney in prose, "Goldy," unlike his usual self, came back with a rapier thrust: "If Dr. Johnson should write a fable, little fishes would talk like whales."

Without a doubt the translation will not satisfy the purists, who unreasonably cling to strictly classical vocabulary and who regard any work combining different periods as a kind of hybrid Latin, unworthy of association with works of distinction. Granted that any attempt at fusion runs the risk of disaster, nevertheless the author has employed a language generally pleasing, harmonizing well with the various moods of the original. He has rendered the descriptive passages admirably. The comic parts can still produce at least a smile, which in a translation is no small praise; and even the tender passages do not fail to awaken sym-

pathy. How superbly human, for instance, is the engaging "fiz" tried by Malampo, the polecat. Like a modern racketeer buying off a corrupt public official, he makes his proposition to split the spoils with Pinocchio, the temporary guardian of the chicken coop. Immediately, in the next chapter, the pathetic note enters into the adventures of Pinocchio — Pinocchio at the tomb of his beloved little sweetheart with the turquoise heart.

The translation with its delightful diminutives and repetitions would touch the heart of a little Roman of the Empire, just as the original does his counterpart today. The Latin edition is worthy of commendation to American schools primarily because there is a general need for interesting reading materials in Latin. Such reading abounds for the modern languages, but the Latin teacher is seriously handicapped.

Maffacini's attempt is not the first of its kind. The famous Mount Hope Classics, which never became widely diffused despite their excellence, attempted the same thing, but the work of Avellanus is too difficult for our high school students. Besides the Mount Hope series, such other initiatives have been made as the adaptation of *Robinson Crusoe*, published by St. John's Press. But available material of this nature is still out of proportion to the need. Unfortunately the vast Latin literature of the centuries has scarcely been tapped for use in schools. Rightly or wrongly, attention has been paid almost exclusively to the classics. A broader view of Latin may so awaken interest, the quickener of learning, that the number who actually learn Latin will perceptibly increase.

VINCENT VASEY, S.M.

University of Dayton

LATIN FOR FUN

Harriet L. Malone thinks it profitable to mix pleasure with business in the learning of Latin and sees to it that her junior high youngsters do not have an excuse, even in flippant mood, to inscribe their texts with such out-moded advice as this: "If caught in a flood, hop on this book. Boy! is it dry!" She lists a few of the "tricks" she has gathered as a *modus operandi*.

I. CONUNDRUMS. (Used for vocabulary review or Latin Club diversion, these may stimulate eager participants to offer additional, original conundrums *ex tempore*.)

How do *men* feel after a hard day's work? (*viri*)

What kind of fish are not *good*? (*boni*)

What did you hear in the *night*? (*nox*)

What did the girl say when the boy washed her face in *snow*? (*nix*)

What did the careless cook *give* her family instead of bread? (*do*)

What paper do you buy *after* breakfast? (the *Post*)

II. VOCABULARY DRILL. Words to be memorized may be entered into note books in such a way as to develop lists under such headings as the following suggest.

<i>Ludus</i>	<i>Domus</i>	<i>Familia</i>	<i>Exercitus</i>
pagina	Mater	Mater	imperator
lectio	Pater	Pater	milites
magister	amare	frater	equi
liber	amicitia	soror	gladii
creta	Deus	avus	tubae
stilus	laborare	anus	tela
carta	diligentia	liberi	pugnare

III. POSTERS, PAPERS, REPORTS may be assigned on such topics as "Latin in Law," "Latin in Medicine," "Latin in the Press," "Latin in the Church," "Latin in the Home." (Even the least imaginative youngster takes interest in the omnipresence of Latin in the home — from the pantry, as an ingredient of Bis-quick, to the Magna Vox in the parlor.)

IV. ROMAN NEWSPAPERS. Whether simple or elaborate, this endeavor can motivate both the writing of Latin and a broader study of Roman life for news items (about Caesar, for instance), notices of Roman laws, a section on styles (as the latest style in jewelry — "a band of gold worn about the wrist and called a bracelet").

V. A "LATIN FOR FUN" BOOKLET, for such miscellany as original cross word puzzles, palindromes, mottoes, songs, etc.

VI. LATIN IN ADVERTISING.

VII. LATIN IN NAMES. (E.g., Leo, Marcus, Marcella, Flora, Barbara; or the Latin meaning of the names of the members of the class.)

HARRIET L. MALONE

Shurtleff Junior High School
Chelsea, Massachusetts

HIGH SCHOOL LATIN AND THE BROADENING BACKGROUND

(Read at the Kentucky Classical Association, Ursuline College, Louisville.)

Is it possible to attain culture through high school Latin? First, let us consider what is understood by culture. It is defined as converseance with and taste in fine arts, humanities, and broad aspects of science, as distinguished from vocational and technical or professional skill and knowledge. With the usual one or two year course, this can scarcely be achieved. But it is possible to

make a move in that direction. In view of the broad implications of the term culture, it seems desirable to consider the study of Latin from two viewpoints: first, as broadening the student's background so that he may grow toward culture; and second, as helping him to meet the requirements of the ever-broadening background needed to face a more and more complex life.

A person growing up in our changing world can no longer learn to do one thing only and feel "fixed for life." If he does, he may find himself either standing still or having to train for something new, with but scant opportunity to do so. Some degree of versatility is almost a *sine qua non* for success in the business world. But such success is, in some measure, conditioned by non-business or leisure activities. It is well recognized that the ability to get on with people plays an important part in success. Young people, then, must increase their understanding of other people, not only in their own community, but also in other communities and in other countries. To do this they must regard themselves not only as responsible citizens, prepared to give loyalty, service, and integrity to their own government, but also as world citizens who are privileged to share in mankind's urgent effort toward international and humane law and order.

Many are the facets of our priceless classical heritage. Time was when all facets gave forth a dazzling light and quivered as they reflected some ray returning to its source, the brilliant emanation of a brain nurtured at the wellspring of the Muses. The high polish of some facets is doubtless permanently dimmed. There are few who write Latin as a medium of communication, and fewer who speak it. Certainly there are few, if any, who grow up like Montaigne, to be bilingual in it.¹

Where, then, does the light from the classical past fall? How can Latin help a modern student get a broader outlook or face the complex present with courage and equanimity, and widen his sympathy and understanding of all condition of men? The beginning will be a modest one. "The master of language," says Professor White, "is frequently the master of life-situations."² From the very beginning Latin helps in spelling and in grammar. A Latin student knows why "It is I" is correct, why "separate" is spelled with -par- and not with -per-, and why words like "collect" have double el. Both the student and his English teacher bear witness to the advantage the Latin student has in understanding conjugation

and sentence structure. He may even ejaculate, "Why, I'm learning more English grammar in Latin class than I am in English!" Then he grows watchful for words in English derived from those in the vocabularies. The discovery that he can deduce the meaning of words quickens his interest. There is a thrill akin to triumph when the dictionary sustains his judgment. Now he will profit from learning the derivation of terms used in other subjects, and in building word-families. With constant notices to read and forms to fill out, he needs to understand words. He knows that the chimney emits smoke, whereas the debtor remits his check. He should be able to avoid the misunderstandings that arise from the misuse of words.

It is generally agreed that comprehending the meaning of a Latin sentence or paragraph develops the ability to gather information, while suspending judgment until all the evidence is in. The student learns to think in an orderly manner. He has a definite method for attacking a problem. His responses to a new situation will not be purely emotional, for he is learning to view a problem from many angles and to think for himself.

Opportunities to correlate Latin with social studies are numerous. Abundant materials are available for investigating how the Romans lived, thought, and educated their children; how they governed themselves and their conquered peoples. This gift of government is one of our richest cultural legacies, as everyone knows.

Amazement often attends one's learning that the Romans had many conveniences that we are prone to think of as modern, such as water piped into the house. Gradually the student is led to see that the present has developed from the past, and that its roots reach back to mingle with those of Greece and Rome. He may even come to observe that all human beings have much in common, no matter when they lived, or where. He may realize how essential it is to avoid the weaknesses that brought Rome low. He will be convinced that he is under obligation to take an intelligent part in his own government. This maturer understanding grows more naturally from a study of Cicero, which some regard as a course in civics.

The person who has learned mythology through Latin understands better what the artist or the composer is trying to interpret for his public; he is moving toward that familiar acquaintance with the humanities that results in culture.

The purest delights to be had from high school Latin are, it seems to me, those derived from a first-hand acquaintance with works of real literary merit: those of Cicero, Vergil, Ovid. By that time the student is ready to get an over-all view of the part the classics played in developing literary forms borrowed by successive generations of writers, such as the epic, lyrics, pastoral poems, drama, satire, oratory. He can learn, too, that the preservation of this rich heritage was due to the diligence of the monks, who profited by the Roman genius for system and organization. A student finds Latin of immeasurable assistance in understanding what he reads in his English courses.

A single allusion may evoke a vivid scene that could not be described in many words, and yet gives a richness and depth of interpretation to the passage, one that escapes the non-classical reader. Thus the whole tale of pride and its punishment is brought to mind by just three words: "Niobe all tears." In studying Cicero's rhetorical devices, figures of speech, and methods of presenting his arguments, there is many a lesson in how to sway an audience. Sometimes this is done by emotional appeal: "O tempora, O mores!"; by surprising his adversary: "Fuisti igitur apud Laecam, illa nocte, Catilina;" by personification, as when "Patria" is calling Cicero to account, saying, "Marce Tulli, quid agis?" Examples can be cited indefinitely.

One proof of the influence of the classics, according to Highet (*op. cit.*, 543), is to consider that if all European literature written on the inspiration of the classics were destroyed, most of the best works would disappear. Some of the better students might be interested in seeing how many of Shakespeare's plays would thus be lost to us. Twelve of his plays are based on classical themes, and he uses classical imagery abundantly. The clarity, dignity, and precision of the Declaration of Independence and our other public documents exemplify the influence of training in the classics.

The student of Latin is then better fitted through his command of words to express himself forcefully, to understand the terminology used in many fields to which new inventions constantly add new words. He has a more sympathetic attitude toward other peoples because he has a knowledge of other civilizations. He has the best possible foundation for learning modern languages, for which there is a growing need. In short, he will be reasonably equipped to meet life's complexities. He will have the

breadth of background that leads toward culture, culture which Desclos aptly defines as "knowledge transmuted into power, the result of a method of training the mind to think, to think clearly. Culture is what remains when you have forgotten everything else. What is it that remains? Many things: the understanding is quickened and deepened, breadth of outlook, sympathy, refinement of taste, a critical habit of mind, . . . of thinking for oneself, an unbiased approach to any problem, . . . a proper and balanced conception of the various uses of life, of its graces as well as its utilities."¹ It is in the hope of giving some of our students some of these elements of a full and well-rounded life that we teachers struggle with the weak students along with the capable. The classical tradition has meant so much to us that we feel compelled to share it.

MOLLY B. T. COYLE

Louisville, Ky.

NOTES

¹ Highet, Gilbert, *The Classical Tradition*, 186.

² White, Dorrance S., *The Teaching of Latin*, 19.

³ White, *op. cit.*, 14f (quoting from "The French Conception of Education," *Mod. Lang. Journ.* XIX, 264f).

BREAD-WRAPPER PALINDROME

Margaret Ihlenfeldt of the Springfield High School, Illinois, recently experienced that special kind of pleasure a Latin teacher feels when her students make a discovery for themselves — a discovery made exciting because they know some Latin. Miss Ihlenfeldt writes that her students opened their eyes in amazement when one of their number brought in a bread wrapper that had been blowing around the campus and showed them the following legend printed upon it.

The World's Most Amazing Sentence.

These are real Latin words and the general meaning is "God, the Creator, rules the motion of the Universe."

Sator Arepo Tenet Opera Rotas

Not only does this sentence read the same backwards as forwards but the initial letter of each word spells the first word, the second letter of each word spells the second word, the third letter of each word the third word and so for the other two words. Never was there a sentence like this one!

The Springfield High Latin students also noticed that the last letter of each word spells the first word, the next to the last spells the second word, and so on for the other three words. *Mirabile visu.*

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Volume 49 Number 3
DECEMBER 1953

Bacchus as Inspirer of Literary Art

OTHER ARTICLES have undertaken to clarify certain misconceptions regarding drinking conditions in ancient Greece and Rome along with the questions that have developed in the course of this investigation. Another readily comes to mind, namely what did our classical forerunners think of the place of wine in literary inspiration? It is the aim of this study to see what answer ancient writers made to this query. It seems best to begin with the poets, to organize their responses affirmatively and negatively with the Greeks coming first and the Romans following after. After the poets have had their say, the critics have a chance to express their views.¹

Taking up the affirmative, one will naturally begin with Homer, whom for his excessive praises of wine Horace charges with being a toper.² The editors³ cite from the *Iliad*⁴ in illustration of Horace's dictum;⁵ but it should be noted that the words of this passage are from the mouth of Hecuba, not of the poet. She is urging Hector to take a drink; but he straightway refuses the offer for fear that the wine will unman him. More pertinent to this chapter is the passage⁶ from the *Odyssey* in which Penelope speaks to the rhapsodist, Phemius. The conversation takes it for granted that epic rendition regularly took place at a drinking party. Even the didactic Hesiod, at the thought of a choice wine, can wax poetical. In the *Works and Days* he says: "When the artichoke blooms

(June), let me have a shady rock and wine in Biblis."⁷ The great iambic poet Archilochus, credits wine for his skill in dithyrambic poetry.⁸ Then there is Alcaeus, the lyric rival of Sappho. Athenaeus states that he was drunk when he composed his poems.⁹ The critic bases his charge upon the following evidence. The poet, as Athenaeus points out, is always talking of drinking — in winter, "Mixing the sweet wine without stint;" in summer, "Wet your lungs with wine;" in springtime, "Hurry and mix me a bowl of the honey-sweet;" in the midst of disasters, "The best remedy is to bring in the wine and to get drunk;" in better times, "Now, 'tis meet to drink even unwillingly since Myrsilus is dead;" in general, "Plant no other tree than the vine."¹⁰ Solon associated¹¹ Dionysus with the muses and exemplified this camaraderie in a story¹² one would not willingly forget. It seems that at a drinking party a nephew of Solon's sang a song of Sappho's. The uncle liked it so much that he would have it taught him. One of the company asked him why he took so much interest in the poem. Solon replied, "I would learn it and die." Pindar seems to come out for wine as the "prompter of song;"¹³ he speaks of the wine cup that "emboldens speech,"¹⁴ and likes his wine old but his songs new.¹⁵ Another poet who associated wine and song was Theognis, who liked to drink wine, to sing songs to the accompaniment of the flutes, and to hold the tuneful lyre in

his hands.¹⁶ In reading Theognis' lines, one feels a Bacchic atmosphere¹⁷ pervading the whole and reminiscent of Bacchus if not necessarily stimulative of poetry. Xenophanes¹⁸ pictures the drinking bowl as being full of delight. Similar sentiments come from Ion,¹⁹ who holds wine to be the only blessing men have. He will drink, play, sing, and dance.

The dramatic poets also were held to owe their power to Bacchus. Wine and literature were said to have the same origin; and both comedy and tragedy were reputed to have originated in Icaria, a village of Attica, at the time of the vintage, *tryge*; hence, comedy at first was called *trygoedia* (vintage song).²⁰ Among the playwrights there is Epicharmus, who denies²¹ the dithyrambic power to water drinkers.²² The first great writer of tragedy was Aeschylus. According to Athenaeus he wrote his tragedies in his cups.²³ Although, as Professor Gulick²⁴ points out, this bit of gossip derives from a joke of Sophocles', yet it is indicative of Bacchus' place in the tragic tradition. The reason for Aeschylus' dependence on wine is symbolized in a story from Pausanias. The future dramatist as a lad was sleeping in a field on watch over the grapes. Dionysus appeared to him in a dream and bade him write tragedy. When it was day, as Aeschylus himself says, he wished to obey the god and found the task most easy.²⁵ Sophocles himself is said²⁶ to have been very pleasant over his wine, and witty.²⁷ Ion²⁸ would have a man include a bit of satyr play in the trilogy of his virtues.

The comic poets too were under obligation to Bacchus. Aristophanes is coupled by Athenaeus with Alcaeus as being drunk when he wrote,²⁹ and Plato, in his *Symposium*, speaks of the comedian as dividing his time between Dionysus and Aphrodite.³⁰ Of the comic writers Cratinus got much publicity for his attitude toward drinking. He it was that Aristophanes pilloried as be-

ing laid aside for his drinking.³¹ Cratinus came back with a play which he called *The Flagon*³² and thereby won the prize over his critic. Cratinus' dictum about the power of Bacchus is cited in Horace: "If you believe old Cratinus, no verses which are written by water drinkers can please or be long-lived."³³ ³⁴ Athenaeus gives Cratinus' words more fully: "Wine, to be sure, is a mighty horse to the artist, but you who drink water can never produce anything worthwhile."³⁵ Athenaeus continues: "Thus spoke Cratinus, and breathed not only of one wine skin but smelled of every cask. Therefore, his halls were decked with wreaths, and he had a brow like thine, O Dionysus, yellow with the ivy berry."³⁶ "This same Cratinus," so says Aristophanes, perhaps in jest, "died of vexation at seeing wine running to waste from a broken jar."³⁷

Some of the later comedians see nothing in water drinking. Thus, a comic fragment holds that wine can make one take part in the chorus even though previously unmusical;³⁸ and Athenaeus says that from dry fodder will come neither jests nor impromptu poems.³⁹ Antiphanes says, "They that eat abundant food must moisten it."⁴⁰ Phrynichus lampoons Lamprus, the musician, thus: "And the pipes began a dirge while Lamprus lay a-dying among them — a water drinker, a petty charlatan, a mummy of the muses, a scarecrow for nightingales; a song of Hell."⁴¹ With this should be put the remark of Amphip: "There seems to be reason in wine after all; whereas some water drinkers are silly."⁴² There are other testimonies to the inspirational powers of wine. Philoxenus of Cythera, a dithyrambic poet of 400 B.C., praises wine as full-flowing, making eloquent;⁴³ and Chaeremon, the tragic poet, characterizes wine as bringing to the user cheer and wisdom, foolishness and good counsel.⁴⁴ Simonides, noting a common⁴⁵ origin for wine and song, thinks that none of Bacchus' gifts

should be scorned,⁴⁶ not even a grape seed.⁴⁷ Antiphanes also is quoted as saying that moderate drinking makes one become full of ideas.⁴⁸ Another writer, Hedyllus by name, corroborates these sentiments, saying: "Let us drink; perhaps among our cups we may find some wise and happy plan;"⁴⁹ and again, "From morn till night the thirsty Socles sits and drinks. How his wits sparkle! Follow his example and while you write, my friend, drink too."⁵⁰ Socles would have found a congenial companion in Anacreon⁵¹ who sings, "I have drunk up a whole jar of wine and now I play my lovely lute."⁵² Anacreon calls⁵³ upon a passer-by to pour him out a libation, saying, "I am a wine bibber." Whether this confession is convincing or not, in view of the tradition given below,⁵⁴ is hard to say. Yet his countrymen clearly took him at his word. They erected⁵⁵ statues picturing him as a drunken poet. They characterized him similarly in many an epigram.⁵⁶ Plato, too, wonders if drinking parties will not make the participants more ready to sing chants and incantations.⁵⁸ Plutarch⁵⁹ owns that wine may enliven the wits of some.

The Greek Anthology contains several items of poetic support for Dionysus. In one of these, Antigonus of Carystus writes of a frog sitting in a wine bowl. The frog congratulates itself on its change of habitat, saying: "Alas, there are those who drink water, being mad, but with a temperate madness!"⁶⁰ Again, Antipater of Thessalonica sings: "Away with you who, merely playing at your versifying, drink only simple water from the sacred font. Today we pour libations in honor of the birthday of Archilochus and manly Homer. Our bowl receives no water drinkers."⁶¹ Antipater would not have been disappointed in Callimachus if one can judge from his epitaph: "This is the tomb of Callimachus that thou art passing. He knew how to sing well and laugh well in due season over the wine."⁶²

The foregoing tributes to Bacchus comprise the most significant testimonies of Greek writers to the helpfulness of wine in literary effort. The beauty of many of these sentiments, if indeed their authors wrote them under the influence of liquor, goes far to confirm the proponents of Bacchus in their championship of his claims.

THERE WERE ROMANS, too, who primed their muse with a drink of wine. Father Ennius was said never to sally forth to sing of arms unless he drank.⁶³ The tradition that Bohemianism and poetry go together begins among the Romans early in the Second Century B.C., with the young Romans Polybius⁶⁴ wrote of as enlivening dinner parties with wine and poetry.⁶⁵ Horace owns that Bacchus may apply the gentle goad to a stupid mind;⁶⁶ he calls wine a teacher of the arts and asks, "Whom have plentiful cups not made eloquent?"⁶⁷ Catullus, the lyric poet, cries: "Water, begone; away with you, water, destruction of wine; and go to live with serious folk."⁶⁸ In another poem he tells of a drinking party in which the guests pleased their several fancies in writing verse while they laughed and drank.⁶⁹ The Pseudo-Tibullus maintains that Bacchus presents a friendly front to those that cherish him, but that he attacks the austere with all his might.⁷⁰ Propertius states the case for Bacchus thus: "Let the muse inspire poets in their cups; Bacchus, it is thy wont to bring Phoebus to fruition."⁷¹

In fact, one must own wine to be a stimulant of some verse, at least if one accepts as a criterion the Bohemianism of Roman Elegiacs with their pictures of young men drinking,⁷² cajoling rivals by getting them drunk,⁷³ flirting⁷⁴ with girls by tracing their sentiments in wine on the table, drinking⁷⁵ with girls until the day broke; of tipsy lovers besieging⁷⁶ the door of the beloved; of the sexes together speeding the night with drinking⁷⁷ and making

the neighboring street ring with their racket; of a poet drinking with a girl who became all the more charming for the drink and another all the more exciting for her tipples when his mistress broke in on the revel, drove the wenches out into the street and roused the neighborhood with the rumpus,⁷⁸ and so on for scores of items throughout Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid.

Later, in the Silver Age, Seneca,⁷⁹ in accepting the dictum that the poet has a touch of madness about him, seems to include frenzy superinduced by wine as of use in touching off the poetic spark. Still this statement of Seneca's hardly warrants Aubrey Stewart's rendering⁸⁰ of Seneca's "*Sive Platoni 'frustra poéticas fores compos sui pepulit' "* by "*Plato always knocked in vain at the door of poetry when he was sober.*" A better translation would be: "*If we (hold) with Plato that the sane mind knocks in vain at the door of poetry.*" The fact is that Seneca's source in the *Phaedrus* contains nothing about wine, nor is it necessary to read into the Latin a Bacchic significance for *compos sui* just because Seneca has been talking about the inspiring power of wine. To tell the truth, the essayist here passes on from the Bacchic phase of the discussion to that of poetic frenzy in general; in fact, the passage in question is immediately followed by Aristotle's famous statement that genius has a bit of madness in it. Martial in a passage or two confirms the tradition that wine and poetry go together. He pictures⁸¹ two boon companions reciting verse, singing, and drinking together. He himself on one⁸² occasion called for repeated cups of half and half, promising himself that fifteen poets would come to his aid while he was drinking and owning that he could do nothing while sober. Especially does Martial note the aphrodisiac influence of alcohol on literary aptitudes, pretending that his salacious⁸³ lines are due to too much drink

and that drinking will make the reader put up with risqué⁸⁴ verses, and picturing the reading⁸⁵ of questionable books at revels.

A poet of the later empire, Ausonius, also held a brief for Bacchus. In regard to one Crispus, Ausonius refers to the time when his friend would fill up on wine with a view to rivaling Vergil and Horace.⁸⁶ Ausonius warns his readers to preface the reading of his book with a drink; for he writes not for the dry, adding, "If anyone reads my book after a drink, he will be wise."⁸⁷ In like vein this poet tells how he has struck off some lines while in his cups and begs his reader to read under the same conditions; for "it is not fair for a sober reader to express judgment on a timpling poet."⁸⁸ Martial had anticipated this sentiment by many years, telling a tipsy volume of his not to knock at Pliny's door until evening when the drinking is on and even stern old Cato will read such books.⁸⁹

THE PRECEDING CITATIONS would apparently warrant the conclusion that Greek and Roman poets held⁹⁰ wine to be a stimulator of wit, eloquence, and verse. But there are many deliverances susceptible of a contrary meaning. Illustrations reinforcing this skepticism are found in the authorities. Euripides⁹¹ is a bit skeptical of Bacchus as a patron of art. Aulus Gellius preserves a query of the poet in which he would know what man needs besides bread and water.⁹² There is the tippler who would be a wit quoted from Theognetus' *Slave Devoted to His Master*. This toper, Pantaleon by name, often after a drunken revel would "crack jokes one after the other, trying to raise a laugh with his unending chatter."⁹³ Another satire on the notion that drinking stimulates the mind, comes from the pen of Aristophanes.⁹⁴ The poet, writing during the Peloponnesian War, is a peace propagandist. He is aiming to discredit the military staff and repre-

sents the two principal Athenian generals, Nicias and Demosthenes, as trying to find out a way to commit suicide. Nicias has suggested that they drink blood (a popular way of accomplishing such a purpose). This colloquy follows:

Dem. "Blood!" No. The unmixed wine of the good Deity! From that, no doubt, we'll get some useful scheme.

Nic. "Unmixed wine," indeed! What have we to do with drinking? How can a man when drunk get a lucky plan?

Dem. You'll find nothing more practical than wine. See! When men drink they become rich, accomplish their wishes, win their suits, make themselves happy, help their friends. Bring me out quickly a bowl of wine that I may moisten my wits and speak something clever.

Nic. O me, what good will come of all your tipping?

Dem. Much, bring it out; I'll lay me down, for when I'm drunk, I'll spatter everything with bits of plans, thoughts, and ideas.

None of the ancient writers confessed himself more in debt to Bacchus than did Anacreon.⁹⁵ The young writer who imitates him in the fond hope of becoming a poet as well, will be interested in the following comment from Athenaeus: "Anacreon in his poetry treated only of drinking. Consequently, he is slandered as having given himself over to loose-living, though many do not know that he was sober while composing his poems, and being an upright man, merely pretends to be drunk though under no such necessity."⁹⁶

This same Anacreon has lent his prestige as a winebibbing poet to a group of poems known as *Anacreontics*. Several of these play on the wine motive. In one a singer notes that the earth, trees, sea, sun, and moon are all drinkers and cannot see why anyone should object to his drinking.⁹⁸ In another the poet cites such famous madmen as Orestes, Ajax, and Heracles and proposes himself to go mad with drinking.⁹⁹ In others wine is the stimulator of love¹⁰⁰ or dancing.¹⁰¹ There is little

suggestion, however, that wine is the inspirer of song.

Athenaeus cites the poet Eubulus as saying that water makes those who drink it no less inventive; whereas wine beclouds our thinking.¹⁰² This is the Eubulus of whom Leonidas in the *Greek Anthology* writes: "Remember temperate Eubulus, ye passers-by. (He died) so let us drink; Hades is the common haven of us all."¹⁰³

Another reputed champion of wine was Alcaeus;¹⁰⁴ but as with Anacreon, his championship may have been more or less of a convention. Three of Alcaeus' most significant fragments are attacks on drinking. In one,¹⁰⁵ he criticizes some usurper for filling the whole house day and night with unmixed wine and carrying on carousals in the place where the law was wont to speak. When this wastrel was overthrown, Alcaeus got little comfort over the fact, because the victor kept up the nightly wassailings; the place rang again and again with the clank of flagons as the drinkers set them down empty. In another, Alcaeus gives a lesson in the psychology of drinking. He speaks of a sane drinker who found drink a pleasant thing, but who ceased to be pleased with his habit when he came to maturity. "For," says the poet, "if one enchains his wits with wine, he lives no life at all. He hangs down his head, often finds fault with his own soul, and repents him of his folly."¹⁰⁶ In the third, Alcaeus leaves a criticism of drinking that could ill be spared; for it not only shows what Alcaeus thought of the Bacchic emotion as compared with emotional reactions from nature, but it must be taken into account in any attempt to appraise the attitude of the ancients toward nature. The poet pictures two sailors as wassailing the night through. It is time to be off, but one of them will not go. The other upbraids the tippler, saying: "I will not let you go on spending the day drinking and singing. O, why are we

sparing of the sea, wasting the frosty freshness of the morning in drunken sleep? Had we but quickly boarded our bark, seized the helm, unmoored the ship, and turned the sailyard to face the breeze, then merrier should we be and light of heart and the work would be no harder than a long draught of wine."¹⁰⁷

As in the case of Anacreon and Alcaeus, Epicharmus' support¹⁰⁸ of Bacchus calls for a word of qualification. There is extant a dictum of his that total abstinence and persistence in mistrust are the very essence of wisdom.¹⁰⁹ There is some reason for holding this to represent Epicharmus' real sentiment. He was closely allied in thought with the water-drinking Pythagoreans,¹¹⁰ leaving such bitter characterizations of the drink habit as his road to the stocks¹¹¹ and a fine.¹¹²

Sappho,¹¹³ Alcaeus' fellow poet, seems to have taken little interest in the Bacchic emotion, if one is to judge her by the numerous extant fragments. Pindar, though ascribing some inspirational¹¹⁴ power to wine, yet sees through the pretensions¹¹⁵ of Bacchus, whose devotees are sailors "on a wide sea of golden wealth, sailing to some visionary shore where the pauper is then rich." The Theban poet also makes wine inferior to water if one may take Athenaeus' ¹¹⁶ interpretation of Pindar's phrase, "Water is best." No less ironical is Bacchylides' characterization¹¹⁷ of wine: "A sweet compulsion, coming from the cups, warms the heart, giving men top-lofty thoughts. Soon it breaks down even the battlements of cities and inspires dreams of kingly sway. Thus, does the drinker's heart rise up." Theognis, though commending¹¹⁸ wine, had difficulty in appraising it; he said:¹¹⁹ "Wine, I praise you and I blame you; I cannot hate you or love you unqualifiedly; you are noble and base. Who, duly possessed of wisdom, would criticize you or commend you?"

The collection of Greek Lyrics known as *Lyra Graeca* should possess material vindicating Bacchus' claim to being a necessary factor in the production of poetry. There are some 1582 items in the three volumes of this anthology. Of these, sixty-three have something to do with drinking. Most of these passages owe their preservation to some beautiful phrase or interesting fact. Two or three may be dignified with the name of poem. Yet even these possess only a passing effervescence in no way to be mentioned along with the Aphrodisiac emotion of Catullus' *Lesbian Odes* or Miss Millay's *Fatal Interview*, with the deep-set indignation of Lucretius' *De Natura Rerum*, or even with the quiet reverence of Tennyson's *Crossing the Bar*.

If this showing gives a true measure of Bacchus as the inspirer of art, the best that can be said for him is that he performs the humble function of the match in touching off a magazine in which the real power is some non-vinous emotion. The probable explanation, however, for Bacchus' seemingly negligible performance is that alcohol is from without, a sort of afflatus; and, producing its own satisfaction, does not necessitate any artistic expression of self; whereas an emotion like that of love is from within and, especially when thwarted in any way, imperiously compels its sublimation into some immortal performance, like that of a Beethoven symphony. The story of Orpheus may have more truth than fiction in it. The Thracian bard seems to have made some progress in civilizing the wild Thracians, only to have his work ruined by the importation of the Bacchic cult.¹²⁰ Under such an interpretation the wine god is really an obscurantist stifling the artistic impulses.

There were doubters of wine's artistic powers among the critics. Among these was Plato who says: "Dionysus might in fact be called Didoinsus," a false derivative, taken to mean *making*

us
mig
that
cav
have
Athe
Plat
into
pres
says
thing
much
danc
bette
ogic
wine
puffe
cied)
Laws
exag
This
tion i
who l
havin
Plato
and o
in the
their
ing ch
that l
poetry
Still t
lyric s
his dr
are es
Wheth
anythi
men f
to say
cal fa
poetry
written
drinkin
ment t
One
has to
poets s
drinkin
setting
of Mus
of Ely

us think that we have wit, and "wine might very justly be called *oconous*, that is, thinking that we are witty, because most drinkers think that they have wit when they have not."¹²¹ Athenaeus cites this explanation of Plato's and again more at length goes into the way wine has of falsely impressing us with our wit. "For," he says, "wine causes men to do foolish things; makes even the wise to sing much and to laugh effeminately and to dance, and inspires a word which were better left unspoken."¹²² The *Etymologicon Magnum* quite seriously takes wine as deriving from words that mean puffed up, (*vain*) imaginings, or (*fancied*) profits.¹²³ Plato again in the *Laws* holds that a man in his cups has exaggerated ideas of his power.¹²⁴ This skepticism of Plato found illustration in his *Hippothales* of the *Lysis*¹²⁵ who became all the worse a poet after having had a bit of wine. It is true that Plato would allow men of forty¹²⁶ years and over to engage in drinking parties in the hope that they might be put at their ease and take the lead¹²⁷ in training choruses. One might infer from this that Plato sees possibilities of choral poetry arising from liberal potations. Still this leaves little place for wine in lyric song, since Plato will not admit to his drinking parties the young men who are especially prone to lyric expression. Whether Plato's objection to poetry had anything to do with his forbidding young men from attending carousals is hard to say. If drinking stimulates the poetical faculty and if Plato objected to poetry, he might keep it from being written by keeping possible poets from drinking. One might carry this argument too far.

One may also infer from what Plato has to say about the Elysium of the poets something of his attitude toward drinking for all its being the accepted setting of poetical endeavor. Speaking of Musaeus' and Eumolpus' portrayal of Elysium as one unending revel,

Plato¹²⁸ says, "Their idea seems to be that an immortality of drunkenness is the highest reward of virtue." Moreover, Homer's¹²⁹ praise of eating and drinking makes Plato¹³⁰ wonder if it is fitting for a young man to hear such words? Plato¹³¹ would allow men above forty to drink in the hope that they might profit¹³² thereby, he would regulate¹³³ drinking very severely. Another skeptic was the collector of the *Problemata*, who says: "Men in their cups become lispers; for they respond more to objects of sense perception than to mental stimuli."¹³⁴ Something also may be inferred from Aristotle's¹³⁵ forbidding children to attend the Comedies, for such shows "interfere with the sound education needed to preserve young persons from drunkenness." Again, in discussing¹³⁶ the place of temperance in his theory of virtue as a golden mean, Aristotle holds that in such states man is naturally inclined to the excess and consequently must be strictly on his guard. The difficulty of avoiding such excess comes out in Aristotle's¹³⁷ dictum that the golden mean is extremely hard to attain.

There are other prose writers from whom something may be inferred as to the usefulness of intoxicants in literary production. Gorgias ascribed his having lived more than a hundred years to his never having done anything merely for the sake of pleasure.¹³⁸ Thus, Xenophon,¹³⁹ in his ideal state, makes the young men abstemious even to the point of drinking water, and makes his ideal tyrant guard against intoxication as¹⁴⁰ against conspirators. Isocrates¹⁴¹ advised a pupil of his to avoid drinking parties altogether. Isocrates set before himself the ideal¹⁴² of being subservient to no pleasure so successfully that he completed a major effort at the age of ninety-seven. Demosthenes got much heralding¹⁴³ as a water drinker. Being asked how one might become an orator, Demosthenes¹⁴⁴ replied, "By spending more money on oil

(that is for the purpose of study) than on wine." ¹⁴⁵ Plutarch ¹⁴⁶ approves of Socrates' advice to beware of habit-inducing drinks. Lucian likewise should be included among the doubters. In his *Double Indictment* he brings Intemperance before Justice and makes her "tongue-tied with drink." ¹⁴⁷ Her drinking does not make her fertile of ideas. In *The Parasite* he makes success in the arts depend on self-denial; for "it is impossible to learn them (the arts) while one is making merry with plenty of food and drink." ¹⁴⁸ There is also the younger Dionysius who when asked by Philip how Dionysius' father found time for literary composition, replied in effect, ¹⁴⁹ "Father devotes to such pursuits the time you and I put in drinking." ¹⁵⁰ Plutarch ¹⁵¹ holds that wine may dull the wit of some and that in the stimulation of song and poetry ¹⁵² no other emotion (including, of course, the Bacchic emotion) is to be compared with that of love. Adrian ¹⁵³ the Sophist held that wine interfered with literary inspiration. He could imitate some sophists even though he was drunk, but to mimic Herodes he should have had no wine.

Stobaeus uses analogy to decide whether a poet should depend on wine for inspiration. "Crickets," he says, "are musical, but snails are dumb. Snails like to be wet; crickets, to be warm. The dew calls to the snail and he comes out of his shell; the sun at its height wakes up the cricket and he sings. Therefore, if you wish to be a musician and an artist, whenever your soul in its cups becomes drenched with wine, do not allow it to come forth and disgrace itself; but whenever the soul in sober state is warmed all through with thought, then bid it prophesy and sing strains of righteousness." ¹⁵⁴

SOME LATINs, too, are skeptical of wine's inspirational sources. Lucretius pictures the drinker as he staggers and stammers, loses his sight and mind, and

falls to fighting — "all due to the confounding power of wine." ¹⁵⁵ Lucretius' great contemporary in prose was Cicero. In his essay *On Old Age* he thinks that one may get more of a mental stimulus from associating with others than from drinking with them. He comments on the Greek word *symposium* (drinking together) as characterizing the Greek point of view; whereas the Romans used *convivium* (living together). Cicero prefers the Roman to the Greek notion. ¹⁵⁶ He ¹⁵⁷ also notes that food and drink in plenty keep the mind from working properly.

Horace is among the well-known disciples of Bacchus. Many scholars rate him as being truly a wine poet. The writer has collected and appraised many such items in his article on *The Wine Element in Horace*. ¹⁵⁸ They base their conclusions on the mass of Bacchic data in Horace. They take him at his word when he keeps representing himself as drinking heavily (*Odes* 4.5, 39-40; *Epodes* 11.13-14) and as being in debt to Bacchus. But there is another side to this appraisal. Much of the wine element in Horace has little *efflatus*. Most of his wine poems are redactions of Greek verse or suggested by predecessors. A good deal of his wine verse is but a pose, much written for devotees of Bacchus. Horace has a good deal to say about the self-discipline needed to produce a poet. He compares training in literary art with that for the race-course; he asserts that the prospective artist like the athlete must abstain from women and wine (*Ars Poetica*, 412-414).

The other writers of the Augustan age have little to say about the poetical powers of Bacchus, but frequently express themselves on the wine god's potency in other respects. Thus Vergil notes the delights of Bacchus as inferior to the other joys of the field, ¹⁵⁹ and can cite only such things to his credit as the famous quarrel between Centaurs and the Lapithae. ¹⁶⁰ Vergil ¹⁶¹ utilizes

the Bacchic motive frequently in his *Aeneid*, setting the sack of Troy in a Trojan debauch, and accounting for Aeneas' troubles in Italy by a plot set going with a carouse.¹⁶² As to his own habits the sage of Mantua is said¹⁶³ to have been abstemious in his food and drink; Simcox says¹⁶⁴ a "water drinker." Tibullus seems less of a puritan than Vergil. He cries out, it is true, for a return to the simple life, saying, "Let acorns be our fare and water in the olden way."¹⁶⁵ But on occasion he can call for wine "to dull the torments of unrequited love."¹⁶⁶

Propertius takes one step further from the narrow path of his ancestors, owning himself as bruised with the nightly quarrels of drunkards¹⁶⁷ or returning to his Cynthia from a drunken revel.¹⁶⁸ His preaching, however, is different from his practices; he pronounces a curse on him that first discovered the pure juice of the grape and first spoiled good water by mixing wine with it.¹⁶⁹ He declares that Icarus got his just deserts when he was put to death by the farmers of Cecrop's land, saying: "Thou, Icarus, hast also found how painful is the scent of the vine; thou, too, Centaur Eurytion, didst perish through wine drinking, and thou, Polyphemus, wast ruined by the Ismarian grape. Wine spoils beauty; wine ruins our pride."¹⁷⁰

The experience of Eurytion causes Propertius' contemporary, Ovid, in his *Art of Love* to issue a warning on drinking too much.¹⁷¹ Sometimes, it is true, he would feign drunkenness so that social blunders might be charged up to wine.¹⁷² But when it comes to courting, he would be careful about drinking; one might be deceived, "for wine impairs¹⁷³ one's judgment of beauty.¹⁷⁴ Ovid as an expert on love affairs in his *Remedia Amoris* says in effect: "You ask my opinion on drinking. In reply let me say, 'Drink little or much; the mean between is of no avail.'" ¹⁷⁵ In practice Ovid¹⁷⁶ avows himself a

water drinker, saying to his friend Flaccus, "You know I hardly ever drink anything but water." One would infer from this attestation of Ovid's that his abstemiousness was a matter of common knowledge.

The other writers of the Augustan age have little¹⁷⁷ to say about the poetical powers of Bacchus. In the following years, however, there are several critics who are a bit skeptical of his claims. Among these is Petronius, the Beau Brummel of Nero's court. Without committing himself on the possibility of a proper use of wine in artistic endeavor, he is not at all sure of the stimulating effect of wine upon the arts of his day. He says in his *Satyricon*, "But we are sunk in wine and harlotry and cannot understand even the arts that have come down."¹⁷⁸ Like Horace, Petronius sees no good in tippling, "for if any man seeks to perfect himself in stern art, let him first perfect his character by obeying the law of frugality, nor with wicked companions must he extinguish the fires of his wit with wine."¹⁷⁹

A little later Quintilian in his treatment of the art of eloquence corroborates Horace and Petronius in cautioning the would-be-artist to be on his guard against wine. He says: "To enable us to sustain the toil of study, is not frugal living necessary?" ¹⁸⁰ Again he says: "Let the orator not imitate the vices of the drunkard."¹⁸¹ Here is another sentiment that might be used as a text for a sermon: "Lessons of frugality and temperance needed by the orator are got from history."¹⁸² Lastly, Quintilian would not have an orator speak when heavy with food or drink.¹⁸³ Similarly, Martial¹⁸⁴ cautions against nights of drinking if one would be happy. Still later Fronto¹⁸⁵ was quite willing for society to get along without wine.

The historian of the *Three Gordians* explains the failure of the Younger Gordian to arrive (artistically) as fol-

lows: "They (his literary efforts) seem in truth the work of a man who was talented indeed but wasted his genius in riotous living.¹⁸⁶ The Later Empire has left a distich¹⁸⁷ that pictures Calliope as unwilling to join herself with the drunken Bacchus for fear the tipsy muse may not be able to stand on her own feet. This list of Roman writers ends with Ausonius, who by including abstemiousness among the greatest virtues indicates that his show¹⁸⁸ of writing under the stimulus of wine may be little more than a convention.¹⁸⁹

THIS STUDY of wine in its relation to literary inspiration seems to show that drinking parties to a large degree furnished the occasion for the early epic and for lyric^{190 191} production. Whether one can go further and hold that the writers themselves found in wine a release that came to fruition in these forms is not so clear. There is a good deal of testimony to the affirmative. It seems, however, that great care should be taken in appraising such authority; for much of it is evidently by way of a pose and much of it as strikingly conventional. Modern students are prone to overlook such possibilities. It is also conceded that the Attic drama grew out of the worship of Dionysus.¹⁹² Whether the playwrights at the time of composition or actors when performing were actually under the influence of alcohol is not clear.¹⁹³ Some modern authorities maintain the affirmative of this proposition. There is A. Mommsen,¹⁹⁴ who holds that intoxicants are necessary to arouse the comic mood or to impart the dithyrambic feeling.¹⁹⁵ On the contrary, some literary artists like Vergil and Ovid seem to have made little use of intoxicants. Besides, the critics are inclined to discount the pretensions of Bacchus and very generally and very decidedly discredit alcohol as an artistic stimulus in comparison with a vigorous self-discipline and other stimuli such as love.

This review of the wine element in Greek and Roman poetry seems to warrant one in saying that the ancients often wrote with a Bacchic setting in mind. It is to be presumed that they thought of their audience as being interested in such things. In that respect wine seems to have functioned to some extent as an inspirer of literary art. Some poets may have drunk a good deal of wine; some seem to have been quite abstemious. To particularize in such matters is a bit dubious. Whether it was a general practice to preface verse writing with a drink of wine does not seem certain. At least in making deductions one must be careful not to be too realistic in interpreting the imponderables of aesthetics.

ARTHUR PATCH MCKINLAY

U.C.L.A.

NOTES

¹ No comprehensive study of this subject has come under the eye of the writer, though he has combed the periodicals for titles. Many random observations receive notice *passim* in the following pages.

² Horace *Epistles* i. 19, 6.

³ E.g., Rolfe in a note on Horace *Epistles* i. 19, 6.

⁴ *Iliad* vi. 261.

⁵ Horace *Epistles* i. 19, 6.

⁶ *Odyssey* i. 337-340. Cf. also "the gods have made the lyre a companion of the feast," (*Ibid.* xvii. 271); again, "song and dance are the crown of a feast," (*Ibid.* i. 152).

⁷ *Hesiod Works and Days* 582-589.

⁸ *Anthologia Lyrica*, Archilochus, 77 (Bergk). Cf. Callimachus' "Wine-smitten," Mair, *Callimachus and Lycophron* (New York, Putnam, 1921). Archilochus, fragment 75.

⁹ Athenaeus x. 429 a.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* x. 430 a-b.

¹¹ *Elegy and Iambus*, Solon, 26 (Edmonds).

¹² *Stobaeus Florilegium* (Meineke, II, 6).

¹³ Pindar *Nemean Odes* ix. 46-50.

¹⁴ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁵ Athenaeus i. 25 f. Cf. *Olympian Odes* ix. 48.

¹⁶ *Theognis* 533-534.

¹⁷ With such phrases as: men brought to shame from drink, 501-502; 503-508; finding their heads heavy with drink, 503-508; mastered by drink, *loc. cit.*; bereft of their wits, *loc. cit.*; drinking deeply, 533; reveling wildly, 829; losing their voices at a revel, 939-940; drinking for a prize, 971; cajoled in their cups, 981; drinking to drown sorrow, 990; or holding wakes, 1041-1042.

¹⁸ *Anthologia Lyrica*, Xenophanes, 1 (Bergk).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Ion, I (Bergk). Cf. also *ibid.* 2.

²⁰ Athenaeus ii. 40 a-b.

²¹ For a contrary point of view, see *infra*, notes 108-112.

²² Athenaeus xiv. 628 b.

²³ *Ibid.* i. 22 a, quoting Chamaeleon.

²⁴ In a note on *loc. cit.* (C. B. Gulick, ed.) *Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae* (New York, Putnam's Sons, 1927).

(See page 135)

ORIGINS OF THE WORD "Epyllion"

THE USE OF THE WORD "epyllion" to mean a literary *genre* might have originated among the German scholars sometime before the middle of the nineteenth century. It is currently ill-used to classify poems said to be short epics. Among them are included such poems as Catullus 64, *Culex*, *Ciris*, about two-thirds of the idylls of Theocritus and even parts of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The list is indeed virtually endless, and includes much fragmentary literature and even some completely lost.

The characteristics of the genre revealed in scholarly literature are very confused and highly subjective. Professor Allen's article¹ on the subject is sufficient to give an idea of the utter confusion surrounding the epyllion elsewhere.

The lack of understanding of exactly what the epyllion is, is due partly to the fact that the word is a modern invention. Although most scholars acknowledge its modern origin, apparently only Professor Allen has attempted to place its beginnings in recent time. He has written² that "epyllion" became popular between 1890 and 1900. The evidence to follow suggests that it might have been in fairly frequent use, at least in Germany, before the middle of the nineteenth century.

"Epyllion" appears in context seven times in antiquity, five in Greek and two in Latin. In none does it carry its modern connotation. Aristophanes uses it three times³ in reference to tragedy. It is found twice in Athenaeus⁴ and once in Clement of Alexandria⁵. The two uses in Latin occur in Ausonius⁶. One of these was later quoted by Apuleius (*Apol.* 10). In addition there is an entry in the Greek lexicon of Hesychius (5th Cent. A.D.) which defines "epyllion" as "a versicle or scrap of poetry."

When the word reappears in modern times it has taken on a new meaning.

The modern innovator and his precise meaning of the word are unknown.

The earliest instance I have been able to uncover is under date of 1855 in a Latin dissertation by Moritz Haupt titled *De Catulli carm.* LXIV, published in Berlin. Here the word is used in connection with Catullus 64 and certain poems by Greek Alexandrians. It is reasonable to place its origin even earlier than 1855 because Haupt's use suggests that it was then commonly understood to classify certain kinds of short epic poems.

According to my list, the word next appears in a contribution by Paul Weidenbach, again in a dissertation in Latin by a German scholar. The dissertation, published in 1873 at Jena, bears the title *De Catullo Alexandrinorum imitatione*.

The first use in a work in English may have been in Crutwell's *History of Latin Literature* (1877). Here it appears in Greek form. After the inevitable reference to the "big book" of Callimachus and the Alexandrians, Crutwell writes (in a footnote, p.218, on the Roman Neoterics) that a lengthy epic poem was considered tedious by the Neoterics and that epyllia, or miniature epics, in as many as three books became fashionable. The mention of the length of these poems, upon which Crutwell does not elaborate, is of interest as bearing out the judgment that the *genre* is not well understood. The epyllion is generally considered to be not longer than an average book of Homer, by which is meant approximately 650 lines. Poems claimed to be epyllia vary in length. The total number of verses in some is uncertain because of the scanty remains. Further, the approximation 650 falls far short of or exceeds the length of many poems assigned to the classification. The following titles are indicative of the various lengths of the poems: Catullus 64, *Culex*, *Moretum*, the *Hecale* of Callimachus and parts of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The limitation of length becomes completely meaningless when

one approaches the Byzantine epyllia. Appearing much later than Crutwell's volume, the *Megale Hellenike Encyclopaedia* (1929) lists as Byzantine epyllia poems of well over a thousand lines and at least one as long as 11,400 verses.

Apparently by the last decade of the nineteenth century, hardly later, the use of the word had spread far geographically. In 1894 Georges Lafaye published his *Catulle et ses Modèles* in which he employed the word with an air of familiarity. This volume may very well have contributed to the popularization of the term,⁷ inasmuch as it is mentioned frequently in literature connected with the epyllion after the turn of the current century.

By the time Robinson Ellis' commentary on Catullus was published (1899) the word evidently had been adopted into the English critical vocabulary, and it is found many times in Ellis' commentary on Catullus 64.

The year 1904 marks the beginning of an even wider use and perhaps the solid establishment of the *genre*. In that year Heumann's dissertation *De epyllio Alexandrino* appeared. Previously the epyllion was mentioned only incidentally, but with Heumann's work contributions began to appear in which the epyllion was the major subject. This dissertation can be divided into three sections: (1) learning of the Alexandrians; (2) individual epyllia; (3) characteristics of the epyllion. Heumann's definition is the one commonly used: a small, independent, narrative poem on a mythological subject, written in hexameters.

Heumann's work was followed six years later by another German dissertation, *De stilo epylliorum Romanorum*, by Gerhard May, who examined the style of the Alexandrian epyllion in such matters as meter and arrangement of words.

Some of the aforementioned works must have been read by Joaquin D. Casaus of Mexico. Casaus used the term in his work in Spanish, *Cayo Val-*

erio Catulo: su Vida y sus Obras. Employing "epyllion" only once (p. 265), he thereafter refers to the Epithalamium of Peleus and Thetis as a short epic.

The first American to devote an article to the subject (1913) is Carl Newall Jackson of Harvard. Professor Jackson looked into two of the major difficulties surrounding the Latin epyllion: definition and characteristics. Recognizing the epyllion as a composite poem, he ventured to classify all epyllia as either heroic (found only in Greek) or romantic, short, mythological poems in hexameters and in the epic manner. He distinguished an epyllion from an elegy by meter alone but observed that a consistent epic manner is sufficient to differentiate the epyllion from idyllic forms.

In my list of works there is a span of twenty-eight years before the epyllion again received special treatment. Then the first book-size work on the subject appeared. In 1931 Marjorie Crump's doctoral dissertation at Oxford was published under the title *The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid*. It is still the most extensive treatment of the epyllion available. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is given detailed treatment in it.

In 1940 Walter Allen, Jr., then of Yale University, published an article. "The Epyllion: A Chapter in the History of Literary Criticism," in which he reviewed the meaning of the term, the quarrel between Callimachus and Apollonius, and the characteristics ascribed to the epyllion, reexamining it as a literary type. Professor Allen followed this line of reasoning: (1) the characteristics described by most scholars apply only to the Ciris and Catullus 64; (2) these poems might be regarded as a mixture of types not always compounded in the same proportions; (3) we should banish the term "epyllion" from our critical vocabulary and the grouping of terms under that name from our critical thinking. Professor Allen proposed the use of "epyllion" in a broader sense to include all

narrative poems not in the Homeric style, there being no way to discover the precise nature of the epyllion.

It is discussed also in *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry* (1934) by Arthur Leslie Wheeler, who defines it as a short narrative poem on a mythological subject in the manner of the Greek Alexandrians.

Published in 1944 as volume five in the Yale University undergraduate prize essay series, *Poetical Theory in Republican Rome*, by Lawrence Richardson, Jr., a student of Professor Allen, endeavors to establish the theory and form of the Latin epyllion and to trace its development and influences.

Before closing this history of a word, there remains to be mentioned an article in the *Encyclopedia Megale Hellenike*. The article is particularly concerned with Byzantine epyllia. The epyllion is defined as a brief epic which started as elegiac poetry. Byzantine epyllia generally are the works of unknown writers, but individuals rather than coteries. Among those named are the "History of Alexander" (6,117 verses), "The Story of the Birth and Life of Alexander," "The Story of Belthandrous the Roman" (1,348 verses) translated from the French, and "The Knight Ambassador" (306 verses) also translated from the French. In general Byzantine epyllia are very much longer than the ancient Greek and Latin ones.

The foregoing account does not include occurrences in the various standard handbooks. In them the word is used without elaboration or discussion and generally in passing reference. Nor do I include many isolated occurrences after the word became widely used, immaterial as they are to the question at hand.

The following bibliography includes some works not mentioned above. Some works are especially valuable for all or several aspects of the study of the epyllion. Anyone studying the subject ought to read Allen, Crump, Heumann, Jackson, May and Richardson. The art-

icle in the *Megale Hellenike* and Gidel's book are very valuable for the Byzantine period. Gidel wrote also *Études sur la Littérature Grecque Moderne*, a copy of which I have been unable to secure. It seems to have more details than his second one on that topic which is included in the bibliography. Casasus' book is concerned with the whole of Catullus, but pages 265 to 296 give a rapid but fair history of the epyllion from Greek to Roman times. Chapter 13 is valuable for the influence of Catullus 64. Chislett's book is a collection of notes and reads that way. It contains some suggestive leads on possible influence of poems called epyllia but lacks details.

JOHN F. REILLY

Sacred Heart High School,
Yonkers, N. Y.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, W., Jr. "The Epyllion: A Chapter in the History of Literary Criticism." *TAPA*, 1940, Pp. 1-20.
 Casasus, Joaquin D. *Cayo Valerio Catulo: Su Vida y sus Obras*. Mexico: Ignacio Escalante, 1904.
 Chislett, Wm. Jr. *The Classical Influence in English Literature in the Nineteenth Century and Other Essays and Notes*. Boston: The Stratford Company, 1918. Pp. 150.
 Crump, M. Marjorie. *The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1931. Pp. 284.
 Eldridge, Lulu Geneva. *Num Culex et Ciris epyllia ab eodem poeta composita sint quaeritur*. Dissertation. Freiburg: C. A. Wagner, 1914. Pp. 66.
 Frank, Tenney. *Catullus and Horace*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1928. Pp. 291.
 Gidel, Charles. *Nouvelles études sur la Littérature Grecque Moderne*. Paris: Maisonneuve et Cie, 1878.
 Haupt, Moritz. *De Catulli carm.* LXIV. Berlin, 1855. Pp. 19.
 Harrington, Karl Pomeroy. *Catullus and His Influence*. Boston: Marshall Jones, Company, 1923. Pp. 245.
 Heumann, Johann. *De epyllio Alexandrino*. Dissertation. Koenigsee, 1904. Pp. 65.
 Jackson, Carl Newall. "The Latin Epyllion." *Harv. Stud. in Class. Phil.* XXIV (1913), pp. 37-50.
 Lafaye, Georges. *Catulle et ses Modèles*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1894. Pp. 256.
 May, Gerhard. *De stilo epylliorum Romanorum*. Dissertation. Kiel: Fiencke, 1910. Pp. 103.
Megale Hellenike Encyclopaedia. "Epyllion," 1929.
 Mustard, Wilfred P. *Classical Echoes in Tennyson*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904. Pp. 164.
 Plesant, Charles. *Le Culex: étude sur l'Alexandrinisme Latin*. Paris: Libraire C. Klincksieck, 1910.
 Richardson, Lawrence, Jr. *Poetical Theory in Republican Rome*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944. Pp. 173.
 Schulze, K. P. *De Catullo Graecorum imitatore*. Dissertation. Jena, 1872. Pp. 43.

Wheeler, Arthur Leslie. *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1934. Pp. 291.
Weidenbach, Paul. *De Catullo Alexandrinorum imitatore*. Jena: O. Wigand, 1873. Pp. 42.

NOTES

¹ W. Allen, Jr., "The Epyllion: A Chapter in the History of Literary Criticism." TAPA, 1940, pp. 1-20.

² *Ibid.* p. 6

³ *Ach.* 398-400; *Pax* 531 ff.; *Ranae* 941 ff.

⁴ *II* 65 a b.

⁵ *Strom.* III 3.24.

⁶ *Symm.* 335, 56-58 and *Cant. Nupt.* 360, 14-15.

⁷ Cf. W. Allen's estimate above.

LUCRETIAN REFLECTIONS

IN LINES 311-312 of Book IV of the *De Rerum Natura*, Lucretius describes a mirror or a combination of mirrors that gives back not the usual mirror image (direct image) but what he calls a right-handed image (a reversed image). Even if this is not, as Smith calls it, the most difficult passage in the poem, it has certainly caused editorial difficulties stemming from editorial ignorance of the basic laws of reflection from plane and curved surfaces. These two lines and the five that follow may be translated thus: "Moreover, those mirrors that are little sides, that have a bending (or curve, or angle) like the bending (or curve, or angle) of our side (or flank), send back right-handed images to us for one of the following reasons—either because the image is transferred from one mirror to another and from the second comes back to us after having been twice reflected, or because the image when it comes to us has been turned about since the curved form of the mirror teaches the image to turn itself around toward us."

The editors* in general agree that the mirror in question is a concave cylindrical mirror, and that the reversed image is due to double reflection. Smith illustrates with a photograph showing double reflection in two plane mirrors, and then states that the same result would be obtained with a curved mirror, a statement that is completely false. Robin presents an impos-

sible diagram of rays of light bounding around inside a cylindrical mirror; and makes the absurd statement: "Enfin cette double réflexion a d'autant plus de chances de se produire que la courbure du miroir est moins parfaite: avec les miroirs métalliques des anciens, on a affaire dans ce cas à une infinité de petits miroirs plans, juxtaposés à angle obtus; ce sont peut-être les *latuscula* de L." The first half of the quoted sentence is nonsense since imperfections in the curvature will result only in distortion of the image. If "infinité" in the second half is to be taken literally (as it should be in any discussion of Lucretius who uses such terms only when he means them), each of the plane mirrors will be of infinitesimal width, and the result will be a curved mirror. If Robin means, as he clearly does, a large number of plane mirrors of moderate width, each of them will act like a plane mirror and the result will be a broken series of partial images, each of them direct. It is possible, depending on the number of mirrors and the angle at which they are set, that there will also be some cases of double reflection, giving reversed images; but these will be even more broken and confused than the direct images. Bailey in his note on the passage rightly rejects Robin's last suggestion, pointing out that the construction of a curved metal mirror presents no difficulty; but he accepts Robin's explanation in general and presents a somewhat neater but no more accurate diagram. Merrill's note on line 311, which is 336 in his text, is little to the point although it leaves one wondering whether he thought Lucretius' mirror was concave or convex. Although Munro's edition is much older than the others cited, he comes nearer to the truth. His statement, "A mirror, laterally concave, such as I have before me at this very moment, gives back your image turned as *Lucr.* asserts, i.e. facing you just as if you were facing yourself," is true as far as it goes, but it leaves out one most important point, as we shall see.

In interpreting the passage there are two problems to be considered. First, is Lucretius speaking of a curved mirror or of a combination of plane mirrors; and second, is it his own image which he sees reversed, or the image of some other object? Although the second problem limits the first, it is not raised in any of the editions I have consulted. Usually but not always the poet discusses his own image, and the use of the term *dextera simulacra*, which has little meaning unless applied to the image of a human being, suggests that that is the case here; but we shall have to consider both possibilities.

The physicist speaks of a mirror as forming an image of an object. A plane mirror always forms a direct image. This image is a virtual image, that is it has only a theoretical existence and no rays of light pass through it, but it appears to occupy a position behind the plane of the mirror, and if mirror and object are stationary, the image does not move. As the observer moves, he still sees the image in the same place although of course it appears to him through different parts of the mirror.

A concave spherical mirror, on the other hand, with the exception noted below, forms an image in front of the mirror. This is a real image, which can be caught on a screen like the image formed by a projector. To see it, the observer looks toward the mirror, but focuses his eyes on a point between himself and the mirror. If the object is more distant from the mirror than the center of curvature, the image will be smaller than the object, will be inverted, and will be located between the center of curvature and the focus (a point half way from that center to the mirror). If the object is brought closer to the center of curvature, the image becomes larger and approaches that center from the other direction. If the object is at the center, the image is at the same point and of the same size. If the object moves still closer to the mirror, the image withdraws, and becomes larger than the object. In

all these situations the image is inverted, but if the object is brought closer to the mirror than the focus, the real image disappears and a virtual image, larger than the object, is formed behind the mirror. Since Lucretius says that the image is reversed, not inverted, he cannot be considering a spherical mirror.

If the mirror consists of the inner side of a portion of a cylinder set on end, the statements made in the last paragraph will apply with two important exceptions. The image will be reversed, not inverted, and the horizontal dimensions of the image will be diminished or increased but not the vertical. It follows that unless the object is at the center of curvature, and this can be found only by careful manipulation or measurement, the image will always be distorted. What happens if one looks at himself in such a mirror? If a man six feet tall and eighteen inches across the shoulders stands five feet in front of a mirror curved on a radius of three feet, the image he sees will be reversed, will be of his proper height but only seven inches across the shoulders, and will be in a position two feet in front of the mirror. To see it he will look toward the mirror but will focus his eyes on a point only three feet from himself. If he moves toward the mirror, the image will become broader, but it will draw nearer to him until it is so close that he can see it only with difficulty. When he reaches the center of curvature, the image will be of normal proportions, but he will not be able to see it since he and the image will occupy the same space. If he advances still farther, the image, now broader than he is, will be behind him, invisible to him even if he turns around (unless, indeed, it is caught on a screen), but visible to others who are looking toward the mirror.

I think that we can rule out such a curved mirror. With it the distortion is so much more apparent that the reversal that it is inconceivable that Lucretius should have mentioned the latter

and not the former. This is especially true when we consider how easily he could have explained the distortion on his theory of vision, the idols being laterally compressed when they impinged on the curved surface. But we may note in passing that his second explanation is substantially correct for the concave cylindrical mirror and that there is here no question of double reflection, all the editors to the contrary notwithstanding.

Let us now consider plane mirrors. It is readily apparent and easily demonstrated by household experiment that if two mirrors are set at an angle not too far from a right angle, an image formed by one may be picked up and formed again by the other, and that this second image will be reversed. It is not so self-evident but is easily shown by theoretical demonstration or by experiment that if two mirrors are set to meet at exactly ninety degrees and an observer places himself within the angle formed by the planes of the mirrors, he will see his reversed image centering on the line where the mirrors join. One half of the image is first formed by one mirror and then reflected in the other, while the reverse takes place with the other half. No matter where the observer stands within the angle, his reversed image will be visible to him where the mirrors intersect. It is easy to demonstrate this. Take any mirror with at least one straight edge and no frame (the mirror from a vanity case will do) and hold it against any upright mirror at approximately right angles. Look at your reflection in the angle between the two mirrors and adjust the small mirror until the angle is exactly ninety degrees, that is until your nose assumes its proper proportions. Then wink one eye.

There can be little question that this or something like it is what Lucretius has in mind. His "little sides of mirrors," to use Munro's translation, might well be two small mirrors (each need be only three inches wide for the pair to reflect the whole face) set at

right angles. Or he may mean a wider mirror with narrow mirrors projecting forward at right angles on each side. In such a mirror one would see his normal direct image in the central mirror and a reversed image in each angle.

Finally we have the line: *Assimili lateris flexura praedita nostri*, which has seemed to defy sensible translation. "Endowed with a curve (or bend, or turning, or angle) like that of our side" makes little sense, especially if the cylindrical mirror is ruled out as I think it must be. May I suggest that *lateris* is not from *latus*, side, but from *later*, brick, usually a sun-dried brick, but sometimes one that has been baked in a kiln. "Endowed with an angle like one of our brick," may not be very good, but it makes possible sense. If chronological considerations permit, and I believe they may, one might suggest, first that Lucretius had in mind the baked brick in the form of a right-angled triangle which becomes common in the walls of the imperial period; and second that for *nostri* we read *cocti* or *tosti*. The comparison we need here is, however, not with a brick but with a roof tile, either the *tegula*, a broad flat tile with raised edges, or the *imbrex*, a cover tile sometimes at least with triangular cross section, the choice depending on our interpretation of *latuscula speculorum*. As far as I know *later* is not used in extant literature of a roof tile; but the proper terms, *tegula* and *imbrex*, are both rare, the latter for example not occurring in Vitruvius; and it is just possible that *nostri* conceals some unknown technical term which combined with *later* identifies one type of roof tile or the other. But that I leave to others. In this paper I am neither an archaeologist nor a text critic but an amateur physicist.

RUSSEL M. GEER

Tulane University

NOTE

*In this paragraph reference is made to editions by Leonard and Smith, Madison, Wisconsin, 1942; Ernout et Robin, Paris, 1925; Bailey, Oxford, 1947; Merrill, New York, 1907; and Munro, London, 1886.

Turgenev as a Student of the Classics

IVAN SERGEEVICH TURGENEV (1818-1883), though destined to become one of Russia's outstanding novelists, had originally planned to be a professor of philosophy.¹ It is recorded, however, in the brief biography² prefixed to the Marks edition of Turgenev's complete works published in St. Petersburg in 1898, that, when he entered the University of Moscow in 1833, at the age of 15, he found the fulfillment of his plans somewhat hampered by the fact that no philosophy was being taught in the university at that time. Seven years earlier courses in this subject had been discontinued, and the professor of philosophy had been set to work teaching physics and agriculture.³ After remaining in the University of Moscow for only one year, he transferred to the University of St. Petersburg. Here the situation was little better. There was, to be sure, one professor of philosophy on the staff, but, since he was an Austrian who knew no Russian, his lectures were given in Latin, with highly unsatisfactory results.⁴ Apparently little or no training was offered in the classics, since it is known that Turgenev, while attending the university, took private lessons in Greek and Latin on the side under a German tutor named Walter. The biography in the Marks edition records that under this tutor he read "Horace, Tacitus, Thucydides, Sophocles, and other classics." Walter is quoted as reporting that he "... was an unusually industrious pupil. He zealously read the works assigned to him and labored with the enthusiasm of a real German student. His lessons were done with unusual accuracy. The only thing which could interrupt his studies was hunting."⁵

After spending three years in St. Petersburg, Turgenev decided to go to Berlin to continue his education. In a brief autobiographical sketch⁶ he writes of his stay in Berlin as follows:

"I was studying philosophy, ancient languages, and history. . . . By way of showing the inadequacy of the training received at that time in our [Russian] institutions of higher education, I cite the following fact: in Berlin I studied Roman antiquities under Zumpt and the history of Greek literature under Böck, but at home I had to grub at Latin and Greek grammar, in which I was badly prepared. And I was in no sense one of the weakest candidates."⁷

His decision to complete his education in Germany had been motivated only in part by the insufficiency of the training offered in Russian universities. Of equal importance was the fact that at this time the perennial question of whether Russia should accept or reject Western influence was being hotly debated in intellectual circles in Russia. Turgenev took a vigorous stand in favor of accepting Western culture.

Does not our Slavic race—in the eyes of the philologist and the ethnologist—constitute one of the chief branches of the Indo-European family? And, if it is impossible to deny the influence of Greece on Rome, and the influence of both together on the Germano-Romance world, then on what basis do we refuse to accept the influence of this related, homogenous world on us? Are we so little self-contained, so weak that we must fear every external influence and in childish terror draw away from it as if to avoid being corrupted by it? I say no.⁸

The provincialism he found surrounding him in Russia, therefore, obviously was a source of annoyance to him; but there were various other phases of Russian life which disgusted him, particularly the institution of serfdom, which he labelled as his chief "enemy." "Under this name," he writes, "I assembled and concentrated everything against which I had resolved to fight to the end." And then he adds, with a flourish that reflects his interest in Roman history, "This was my Hannibal's

oath."⁹ Since he was convinced that he could do more to fight serfdom from abroad than at home, and at the same time could be acquiring Western culture, Turgenev took leave of his native land. As he himself puts it, "I hurled myself head downward into the 'German sea,' . . . and when I finally came up out of its waves, I found myself a 'Westerner' and a 'Westerner' I remained from then on."¹⁰

The classics inevitably played an important role in his pursuit of Western culture. Many remarks contained in his works, as well as numerous classical allusions and quotations from Latin, indicate that he became interested in almost every phase of classical study. Not only did he feel a deep appreciation for the art, literature, history, and mythology of antiquity, but he also possessed a genuine admiration for the Greek and Latin languages themselves. He frequently employs Latin quotations and expressions, obviously with great relish. Greek, on the other hand, is never quoted, but he makes it clear in various passages that he has the deepest respect for the beauty of the Greek language. In the eighth stanza of his short poem,¹¹ "To the Medicean Venus," for instance, he speaks of the Greek language as being "luxurious like a kiss." In an essay on Pushkin written in 1880, he remarks that Pushkin has contributed so much to the development of the Russian language that now, in richness, strength, logic and beauty of form, it is considered even by foreign philologists to be second only to ancient Greek.¹²

While many references to Greek and Roman artists and works of art are scattered through the works of Turgenev, the best evidence for his admiration for the art of antiquity is to be found in an open letter published by him in one of the Russian papers in March, 1880 for the purpose of calling attention to some marble reliefs of the third century B.C. which had recently been discovered in Pergamum, acquired by the German Government,

and brought to Berlin. In discussing the subject depicted in the reliefs — the struggle between the gods and the Titans—Turgenev writes, "I cannot, in passing, refrain from remarking what good fortune it is for a nation to possess legends so poetical, so full of deep meaning, so religious, as those possessed by the Greeks—those aristocrats of the human race." At another point in the letter Turgenev, in discussing the artistry of the reliefs, remarks that there is such beauty in one arm of one of the dying Titans that the sight of this arm alone would be worth the effort required for a trip to Berlin. He closes his letter in a somewhat sentimental vein by remarking, "As I left the museum, I thought, 'How fortunate I am that I did not die before experiencing these feelings I have just experienced; how fortunate that I saw all this.'"¹³

Of all the writers of antiquity referred to by Turgenev, Homer receives the most generous praise. In a letter written in 1852 to the editor of *The Contemporary*, a well known Russian journal, he remarks: "They [the Greeks] had a great advantage over us: in their fortunate ears poetry first spoke in sonorous and sweet language of man and nature. . . . Nothing can be compared with immortal youth and with the freshness and strength of first impressions wafted on us from the songs of Homer."¹⁴

References to the works of Vergil indicate considerable familiarity with the *Aeneid* on the part of Turgenev. In the sketch entitled "Lyebiedyan," from *Tales of a Hunter*, the narrator, after stating that he will refrain from giving the details of a particularly unpleasant dinner he has just eaten, adds that Aeneas knew how unpleasant it is to recall past sorrow (Aen. 2.12).¹⁵ In the novel *Virgin Soil*, when two dinner guests become engaged in a violent quarrel which seems destined to end in a duel, the host is finally able to restore order by delivering an eloquent speech. After calm has been restored, the host looks back on his

work with considerable satisfaction. "He had had a chance," writes Turgenev, "to show off his eloquence and calm a rising storm. He knew the Latin language and was not unfamiliar with the Vergilian *Quos ego*. . . . He did not consciously compare himself with Neptune, but he recalled him with a feeling of sympathy."¹⁶ Another of Turgenev's references to the *Aeneid* is in something less than good taste. In his novelette *Spring Torrents*, a young man who is trying to sell some property to the wife of a friend is invited by his friend's wife to go horseback riding with her in the country. In the course of the outing the two are overtaken by a violent storm and are compelled to seek shelter in an abandoned cabin in the woods. As they approach the cabin, the woman calls her companion's attention to the conduct of Aeneas and Dido under similar circumstances by way of indicating her willingness to betray her husband.¹⁷

Turgenev shows at least some familiarity with Aristotle when, in a review of a tragedy by Nestor Kukolnik published in 1846, he reminds the author that he should heed the excellent advice of Aristotle never to introduce into a tragedy a character who is entirely bad or entirely good.¹⁸ This is advice which he himself, incidentally, was generally careful to follow in his own writings.

Other classical writers whose names or works are mentioned by him include Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Plato, Demosthenes, Zeno, Cicero, Sallust, Catullus, Juvenal, and Ovid. Solon and Caesar are mentioned, but as public figures rather than as writers. His interest in the concept that some sorrow is too deep for tears suggests that he may also have been familiar with Herodotus. This idea was developed by Herodotus (3.14) in the story of the Egyptian king Psammenitus, who, after being captured by Cambyses, showed no signs of grief when he saw his daughter being treated as a slave and his son being led away for execution, but broke into

violent sobs when he saw a casual friend reduced to poverty. When Cambyses asked the reason for this strange conduct, his reply was that the sorrow felt by him at the unhappy lot of his son and daughter was too deep for tears, but the misfortune of his friend was not a source of such deep sorrow and therefore was a fit cause for weeping. This same idea is given expression twice in the works of Turgenev, once briefly in the short story, "Diary of a Superfluous Man," when the hero remarks, "I felt unusually grief-stricken—so grief-stricken that I could not cry,"¹⁹ and again at greater length in the sketch, "My Neighbor Radilov," from *Tales of a Hunter*, when Radilov, in telling of the death of his wife, remarks that at first he was so overcome by grief that he was unable to shed a single tear, but, on the second day, as he stood looking at his wife's lifeless body, he observed that one of her eyes was partly open. Just at that moment a fly began crawling over the exposed portion of the eye ball, and, at the sight of this minor incident, he broke into violent, uncontrollable sobbing.²⁰

Many of Turgenev's characters show devotion to the ideals of ancient Stoicism. In one instance—in his short story "Punin and Baburin"²¹—Turgenev notifies the reader of his intention to present a picture of a modern Stoic by representing his hero, Baburin, as showing considerable interest in the career of Zeno. In the early part of the story Baburin asks a university student what he has learned in the university about Zeno. When the student is compelled to admit that he has very little information on the subject, Baburin himself explains: "Zeno is that famous wise man who held that suffering is not an evil, since endurance prevails over all, and there is only one form of good in the whole world—justice. Yes, and doing good is in itself nothing but justice. . . . A certain local figure who gets hold of a lot of strange

books gave me this explanation and I like it very much. But you, I see, don't study subjects of this sort."²² In the course of the story Baburin is represented as manifesting his devotion to his conception of Stoicism, first by marrying Muza, the girl he loved, after she had deserted him to take flight with a lover and had in turn been abandoned by her lover, and later by fighting for the liberation of the serfs in Russia even after he had been exiled to Siberia for his political activities. In the end Baburin dies on the very day he receives word that the serfs have been given their freedom.

In the course of his literary career Turgenev produced six full length novels. One of these, *Rudin*,²³ is the story of the activities of a parasite, but the treatment of the subject is so different from that found in New Comedy that classical influence can scarcely be assumed in this case. Another novel, *A Nobleman's Retreat*,²⁴ deals with the experiences of a young man whose early education, at the insistence of his father, had, in large measure, been modelled after the system employed by the Spartans in antiquity.²⁵ As the plot develops, this young man, Lavretskii, marries a woman who, after a short time, openly becomes faithless to him. A separation occurs, and, in the course of time, Lavretskii completely loses track of his wife. Eventually, thinking she is dead, he falls in love with and becomes engaged to another girl, Liza. Before the wedding takes place, however, Lavretskii's wife puts in her appearance and asks to be restored to her former position. Although Lavretskii feels no affection for her and has no reason to think she will now be any more faithful than she has been in the past, nevertheless he consents, presumably because of the influence of his Spartan training, to accept her back into his home and to go through the pretense of living with her again.²⁶

Of Turgenev's six novels the two which unquestionably aroused the

greatest amount of interest and controversy in his own day were *Fathers and Sons*²⁷ and *Smoke*.²⁸ The storm of protest aroused by the former when it appeared in 1862 is of special interest to the classicist because it centered around his definition and use of a term based on a quite innocent Latin word. The novel deals with the difficulties encountered by the older generation in understanding the attitudes of the younger. The two fathers of the story have eagerly been awaiting the return of their sons from the university, only to discover, when the sons do make their appearance, that it is impossible to derive any pleasure from their companionship, since the youths have discarded all the principles on which their fathers had built their lives. The sons proudly apply to themselves the name nihilist—*nigilist* in Russian, — the term which aroused such a storm of protest on the part of Turgenev's contemporaries. One of the sons, in speaking of the term, remarks: "As far as I can tell, it comes from the Latin *nihil*, 'nothing.' Therefore the word indicates an individual who professes nothing."²⁹ The term nihilist or *nigilist* had not been invented by Turgenev, since Nadzhdin had applied it to Pushkin and others as early as 1829; but Turgenev was the first to employ the word to designate a definite social type.³⁰ His contemporaries apparently felt that in popularizing the expression he was contributing to the encouragement of the type of person to whom the name was applied. In an article about reactions to the novel, he remarks that, on the occasion of his first return to St. Petersburg after the appearance of *Fathers and Sons*, he happened to arrive at the very moment some serious fires were burning in one section of the city. One of his acquaintances ran up to him and shouted: "See what your nihilists are doing! They are burning St. Petersburg!"³¹

Of all the works of Turgenev, the one which owes the most to the classics is the novel *Smoke*, having as its theme

Catullus' famous sentence, *Odi et amo* (85.1). In an early chapter the chief character, Litvinov, a Russian living in Baden, Germany, becomes engaged in conversation with another Russian living abroad, Potugin, who obviously serves as spokesman for Turgenev himself. As the two are debating the merits of Russia, Litvinov suddenly asks Potugin whether he loves his native land. "I love her and I hate her passionately," replies Potugin, who then goes on to explain that his rather startling answer is an adaptation of a remark uttered two thousand years earlier by the Roman poet Catullus.³² As the story develops in subsequent chapters, Turgenev, through his spokesman Potugin, calls attention to many of the phases of Russian life which he loves and many more which he hates. Such frankness on his part aroused a storm of animosity comparable with that which accompanied the publication of *Fathers and Sons*³³ Before the storm had died down, Turgenev had become involved in bitter quarrels with many of his distinguished contemporaries, including the novelist Feodor Dostoevsky. In the novel, discussions of the desirable and undesirable traits of Russia are interspersed among episodes of a love story in which the leading roles are played by the above mentioned Litvinov and a Russian woman, Irene, who symbolizes both the things in Russian life hated by Turgenev and the things loved by him. Since Litvinov is represented as responding with both love and hate to various facets of her character, the result is that the story becomes a Russianized version of the Catullus-Lesbia story. In the Russian novel Irene, who is the wife of a wealthy Russian army officer, becomes the mistress of Litvinov; who, after a brief attachment, becomes unwilling to continue sharing her favors with her husband, and attempts to persuade her to desert her husband and friends and withdraw to some other city with him. She assures him of her eagerness to comply with his wishes, but, after he

has broken his engagement with another girl and has made elaborate arrangements for secret flight, he receives a note from her in which she indicates that she cannot bear the thought of giving up the luxuries to which she has become accustomed, and begs him to maintain their previous relations unaltered. This he refuses to do, with the result that relations between them are permanently broken off. In spite of variations in minor details, the broad outlines of this story are so similar to those of the Lesbia episode that, in the opinion of the writer, there can be little doubt but that Turgenev, who by his own admission had the works of Catullus in mind when he began writing *Smoke*, got the idea for the love story contained in it from the personal experiences of Catullus.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

Saint Louis University

NOTES

¹ This is a slightly revised version of a paper read at the 1952 convention of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South held at Toronto, Ontario, April 17-19.

² *Polnoye Sobranie Sochinenii I. S. Turgeneva v 12 Tomach* (St. Petersburg, 1898) I. ix-xxxviii. Henceforth this work will be referred to simply as the Marks 1898 Edition.

³ *Ibid.* I. xii-xiii.

⁴ *Ibid.* I. xiii.

⁵ *Ibid.* I. xiv.

⁶ *Ibid.* XII. 3-7, published as part of a longer work entitled *Literary and Biographical Recollections*.

⁷ *Ibid.* XII. 4.

⁸ *Ibid.* XII. 6.

⁹ *Ibid.* XII. 5-6.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* XII. 5.

¹¹ I. S. Turgenev, *Sobranie Sochinenii* (Moscow, 1949), X. 108f.

¹² Marks 1898 Edition XII. 340.

¹³ *Ibid.* XII. 178-83. The works of art referred to by Turgenev in this letter are reported to have been removed from Berlin to some unknown place by the Russians in 1945. (Cf. Herbert Hoffman, "The Great Altar of Pergamum," CB, 29, 14-16.) When he assembled the various items which make up his *Literary and Biographical Recollections* (see note 6 above), he numbered the separate items, listing his letter on the Pergamum finds as item XI, and it is so listed in the Marks 1898 edition. In the *Pravda* edition published in Moscow in 1949, the first ten items of *Literary and Biographical Recollections* appear in Vol. X in their correct sequence with numbers attached, but number XI (the letter on the Pergamum finds) is omitted, and the following items are printed without numbers. Whether there is any connection between the removal of the art objects in 1945 and the suppression of Turgenev's letter about them in 1949 can only be conjectured. For additional information about the Pergamum finds, see Esther V. Hansen, *The Altalids of Pergamon* (Ithaca, 1947), pp. 279-330.

- 14 Marks 1898 Ed. XII. 302.
 15 *Ibid.* I. 193.
 16 *Ibid.* IV. 100. (Aen. 1.135)
 17 *Ibid.* VIII. 143 f.
 18 *Ibid.* XII. 282; Aristotle, *De Arte Poetica* 1453a.
 19 *Ibid.* V. 205.
 20 *Ibid.* I. 56-7. Another passage (Marks 1898 Ed., XII. 332) which suggests familiarity with the works of Herodotus is to be found in a speech delivered by Turgenev in 1860 in which he refers to Polycrates' act of casting his ring into the sea to avoid *hybris* (Herodotus 3. 41).
 21 Marks, VIII. 185-247.
 22 *Ibid.* VIII. 215.
 23 *Ibid.* IV. 301-437.
 24 *Ibid.* III. 189-359. This work, which has as its Russian title *Dvoryanskoye Gnezdo*, appears in English translations under various other titles, including *A House of Gentlefolk*, *A Nobleman's Nest*, *A Nest of Nobles*, and *Liza*.
 25 *Ibid.* III. 226 f.
 26 *Ibid.* III. 344.
 27 *Ibid.* II. 3-216.
 28 *Ibid.* III. 5-186.
 29 *Ibid.* II. 23.
 30 *Ibid.* I. xxv.
 31 *Ibid.* XII. 93.
 32 *Ibid.* III. 34 f.
 33 *Ibid.* I. xxix.

We See . . . By the Papers

Edited by John F. Latimer

SWEET LATIN

Up until July 20 last a few hundred students and teachers in the United States knew about Waldo Sweet and his revolutionary method of teaching Latin. Now, thanks to *TIME*, five or six million people, including the majority of Latin teachers in the country, we hope, know about the Sweet method of revitalizing Latin.

In essence it is a "kind of modified Berlitz system," contrived to overcome two errors, one ancient and one modern. The first error goes back at least to Quintilian, who advised Roman parents that their "children should begin by learning to decline nouns and conjugate verbs." To expect that American children should begin in the same way is pedagogically unsound for one simple reason — Latin is not their native language.

The second error is really twofold: elementary texts neglect grammar and sentence structure. Stated in another way, the texts, with their simple sentence pattern of subject-object-verb, cause the "students [to] get the idea that they can identify all words by their positions," and therefore to think of Latin in terms of English grammar.

As correctives, Sweet starts off with a series of lectures or lessons on "how lan-

guages differ," and he stresses particularly the differences between Latin and English grammar. He builds vocabulary by using slides that show changes in meaning by changes in context. Students graduate from slides to tape recordings and find both fascinating.

For the past two summers a special grant from the Carnegie Foundation has made possible two Workshops and a limited number of scholarships. Held at the University of Michigan, these have attracted teachers from all sections of the country. Beginning this fall Dr. Sweet is in full time residence at the University of Michigan. In contrast to a widely circulated comment about another recent academic transfer, this is a case where William Penn Charter School's loss will be Michigan's gain. And because of its enlarged base of operations Sweet Latin will spread far and wide and become a "hot subject" wherever it goes.

KING COTTON AND MYTHOLOGY

What Jupiter was to Rome, King Cotton was to the South, the Deep South, suh, that is. Because the fluffy king has been tottering on his throne in recent years may have had nothing to do with it, of course; but those in charge of the annual Carnival at Memphis, Tennessee brought the ancient Roman gods and goddesses down to earth to pass in review before the monarch of the fleecy fields. According to clippings from the *Press Scimitar* and the *Commercial Appeal*, sent by Miss Mary Park, Latin teacher in the Treadwell High School, fourteen members of the Roman Pantheon were on hand, not counting Mount Olympus. There was Jupiter, with Juno by his side, drawn by a mammoth eagle and most appropriately hurling a thunderbolt — the Carnival was delayed and all but ruined by the worst storm in its history. There was Diana chasing deer, and Saturn exulting over the harvest. Apollo was there, but he was not powerful enough to overcome Jupiter Pluvius who was present in bucketfuls. (*Urceatim* is Petronius' Latin for this — Ed.) Hercules was showing his biceps and Midas his golden touch, the one with pride, the other with regret. While Orpheus played his compelling lyre Venus beamed on all with loving glances, Pandora struggled with the baleful box and Medusa shook her snaky permanent at Bacchus too far gone in his cups to care. And Mars and Pluto reminded one and all of the certainty of death and increased taxes.

The next day cotton futures went up — thanks to the rain god's lavish hand.

The Distribution of Roles in Plautus' *Menaechmi*

THE TWINS, Menaechmus I and II, (Sosicles), are described in the prologue of the comedy (18-21)¹ as resembling each other so exactly in their youth that no one could distinguish between them. Menaechmus II was in his sixth year of searching for his twin brother (234). He had obviously changed to a street costume before leaving his ship at Epidamnus so as not to be mistaken for a traveler by the citizens; for Messenio (258 ff.) reminds him that the town harbors crooks, courtesans and sycophants of all sorts who prey upon strangers. He even connects the name of the city with *damnum* (263-264): *propterea huic urbei nomen Epidamno inditumst*. Throughout the play their identity is repeatedly mistaken by their most intimate associates including Erotium, *matrona*, and *sener*, mistress, wife, and father-in-law respectively of Menaechmus I. Even Messenio, slave of Menaechmus II, who has traveled with him from his home in Syracuse to Epidamnus, is confused; and Peniculus, the parasite of Menaechmus I, is unable to distinguish between them. When the two Menaechmi meet for the first time in the final or recognition scene, Messenio in conversation with Menaechmus II describes Menaechmus I so: *speculum tuom . . . tuast imago. tam consimilest quam potest* (1062-63).

To prevent confusion as to the identity of the twin characters on the part of the audience, Plautus uses two devices in addition to the fact that each Menaechmus makes his identity clear from his speech and the fact that Menaechmus II is much bolder and more direct than his brother. One of these devices has been mentioned by Miss Rambo, who states: "Throughout the play the two strangers (Menaechmus II and Messenio) use the entrance a

peregre; the inhabitants of Ephesus (sic!) use always the local entrance. Thus, despite the confusion motif, the audience is never in doubt as to the identity of either brother."² The second device to identify the twins for the audience at each entrance depends upon a *palla* or robe. This and the preceding device have been commented on by Beare³ as follows: "The two Menaechmi are supposed to be exactly alike; yet it is impossible to mistake one for the other. Each makes his identity clear by his words; each enters and leaves by his own side-entrance; the stolen *palla* which one or the other carries in turn helps further to identify him." When Menaechmus I leaves his home (110) he is *wearing under his pallium*, not *carrying*, a robe which he has surreptitiously stolen from his wife (141 ff. cf. 190-205).⁴ He reveals this to the audience (130-146) and hints at his plan for its use as he boasts to Peniculus. He then goes to Erotium's house where he takes off and leaves the robe as a gift for her (191-202). During the second scene and to verse 202 of the third scene of Act I, Menaechmus I is *wearing* the *palla* under his *pallium* and *these are his only appearances with it*. When Menaechmus II arrives in front of Erotium's house (Act II) and introduces himself to the audience with the help of Messenio, Erotium's cook, Cylindrus, mistakes him for Menaechmus I and so reports to the courtesan. Just before Menaechmus II enters Erotium's house, she requests that he take the robe, which, despite repeated denials, she thinks he gave her, to an embroiderer for some alterations when he leaves (426-7). Menaechmus II is entertained by Erotium in the belief that he is his brother and as he departs both he and Peniculus call attention to the robe (466-7,

480, 508 ff.) which he is carrying. *Thereafter, the robe is the mark by which the audience recognizes Menaechmus II and conversely its absence indicates Menaechmus I.* Soon after this, Erotium's maid (524 ff.) gives Menaechmus II a piece of jewelry, which Menaechmus I had previously given to her mistress, to have repaired and made heavier. Here Menaechmus calls attention to the *palla* which he has (539-40). Peniculus reports to the wife of Menaechmus I that her husband, really Menaechmus II, is taking one of her robes to an embroiderer (563 ff.) and as he catches sight of Menaechmus calls attention to the absence of the robe (568). The *matrona* then confronts this Menaechmus with the theft of the *palla* but, as Peniculus has pointed out and he himself made clear by repeating his gift to Erotium (600-601), he does not have it. This is confirmed for the third time (609 ff.).⁵ A Menaechmus without the robe meets Erotium (675 ff.) to demand the return of his gift; but in the next scene (V.1) the wife of Menaechmus I, who is searching for her husband, meets a Menaechmus with a robe. The father-in-law of Menaechmus I is called into the action in the next scene (V.2) by his daughter. He, too, thinks that Menaechmus II is Menaechmus I. The wife calls attention to the robe and piece of jewelry (806-7) which she thinks he pilfered from her, . . . *Quin etiam nunc habet pallam, pater, (et) spinter* . . . As Menaechmus I returns to the stage in the fifth scene of Act five he draws the attention of the audience to the absence of the robe (907-8), thereby identifying himself. The same device identifies him again (1049) after Messenio has mistaken him for his own master and rescues him from the *lorarii*. Menaechmus I, after a short, time-filling monologue (1039-1049), goes into Erotium's house again to beg for the return of the robe. Presently Messenio returns with Menaechmus II, whom he apparently met on his trip to the inn for

the baggage. At this point no mention is made of the robe but it is clear that it was in evidence for the recognition scene which follows immediately. Menaechmus I, who is coming onto the stage from Erotium's house, denies to those within (1060-61) that he took the robe away with him when he previously left his mistress' house (213-16). He mentions the robe again (1138) while Menaechmus II calls attention to the fact that he is carrying it (1139-42). So this absence or presence of the *palla* forms a rather clever additional device to enable the audience to identify each twin at each entrance.

II

IN VIEW of the elaborate precautions taken to prevent mistaken identification of Menaechmus I and Menaechmus II on the part of the audience, it would seem that Plautus had in mind a single actor for the two rôles. A much more realistic and effective stage performance would be possible if one actor played both parts up until the final or recognition scene where both Menaechmi are on the stage together.⁶ Sufficient time is provided in the action just preceding this scene for the conceivable substitution of another actor in the play for Menaechmus I — possibly the *sener* — since no pause in the action would be occasioned at verse 1060 where Menaechmus II and Messenio are on the stage when Menaechmus I enters. The spoken parts of the two brothers would not overtax the ability of one actor, since they consist, for the most part, of comparatively short dialogues. There are no long, burdensome monologues or monodies, — the longest, a monody, consists of thirty verses (571-601).

Menaechmus I is on the stage continuously during the first three scenes of Act I. Both his exit (216) and the entrance of Menaechmus II (226) are motivated. Menaechmus I goes off stage, followed by Peniculus, to pass the time until dinner has been made ready at Erotium's. Ten verses follow, consist-

ing of Peniculus' final remarks and a dialogue between Erotium and Cylindrus before the appearance of Menaechmus II (226), who is just coming from the harbor into the city. These remarks and the dialogue do not advance the action, and the handling of the cook scene here seems to point to a conscious effort to fill time. The staging of the scene is different from that of other scenes in which cooks appear. Usually they have been hired for some special occasion and boast of their art and skill. Here Cylindrus is the private household cook of Erotium. She calls him from the house into the street to give instructions for the dinner. The entire scene appears to be solely for the purpose of keeping the stage occupied until Menaechmus I may go off stage, pick up the robe and return from the opposite entrance (*a peregre*) as Menaechmus II, who remains continuously in the action during the whole of the second act up to verse 441 when he enters Erotium's house for the dinner. Peniculus appears in a monologue in the first scene of Act III, bewailing his fate at having been separated from Menaechmus I in a crowd. Menaechmus II enters (scene 2) from the house of Erotium and is soon engaged in conversation with Peniculus who has mistaken him for Menaechmus I. Peniculus leaves to inform the wife of Menaechmus I about what he thinks has been going on. Erotium's maid, in a scene of mistaken identity, hands over a piece of jewelry to Menaechmus II; who soon leaves the stage (558) by the entrance, *a peregre*, after throwing a wreath from his head toward the opposite entrance to confuse any who may attempt to follow him. The succeeding dialogue between the *matrona* and Peniculus (559-70) does not advance the action, but is a repetition of what he already must have told the wife after he set out for that purpose (521) — a report of off-stage action. These verses (559-70) could provide a short period of rest for the actor who is playing the two rôles and also

furnish sufficient time for Menaechmus II to leave the stage, drop the robe, change entrances and reappear as his brother in the second scene of Act IV. Menaechmus I is continuously on the stage until Act V. His exit and reappearance as Menaechmus II (701) would necessitate a momentary vacant stage,⁷ but only long enough to permit him to pick up the robe and change entrances. But this slight pause could be filled by the immediate entrance of the *matrona* from her house (701) and her search of the street for some sign of her expected husband, until Menaechmus II enters at the other end of the stage. Menaechmus II leaves the stage (881) and a short monologue of seven verses by the *senex* intervenes before the *medicus-senex* dialogue of ten verses. This would provide enough time for the change to Menaechmus I at 899. A quick change from Menaechmus I to Menaechmus II would be necessary at 1049-50; but, as stated above, only a slight pause would be required, just long enough for Menaechmus I to pass through the door of Erotium's house—her house is nearest the entrance *a peregre*⁸—pick up the cloak and make his entrance as his twin from abroad. Messenio could possibly precede Menaechmus II as he is being berated by his master, following him just out of sight of the audience. In the last scene, Menaechmus II is on the stage with Messenio when his brother comes out of the house of Erotium. Here the substitution of another actor in the play would be necessary if both rôles have been played by a single actor up to this point, possibly the *senex*, who does not reappear after rushing off to the doctor's office (996) without waiting for the *lorarii* with Menaechmus I. Ample time would be provided, 64 verses, for him to undergo some more or less elaborate make-up to enable him to reappear as Menaechmus I (1060). Menaechmus I and, for that matter, Menaechmus II, speak very little in the final scene and amount to nothing more than "yes" men to

Messenio. This would tend to suppress the voice of the substituted actor.

III.

THE DISTRIBUTION of rôles then could be as follows:

- I. Menaechmus II, Menaechmus I up until the final scene.
- II. Peniculus, Messenio, *Medicus*.
- III. Erotium, *Ancilla*, *Matrona*.
- IV. Cylindrus, *Senex*, Menaechmus I in the final scene.

FIRST ACTOR: Menaechmus I and II do not meet in the action until the final scene.

SECOND ACTOR: Peniculus leaves the stage with Menaechmus I at verse 217. The time-filling dialogue between Erotium and Cylindrus could provide time for the change, which would be slight, to permit him to return as Messenio (226). Peniculus returns to the stage (446) after Messenio leaves (445). A slight pause in the action might occur here but could be filled by the time required for the sailors to file off stage behind Messenio, who leaves by the entrance *a peregre* before Peniculus enters *a foro*. No further changes are necessary although Peniculus appears in Act III, scenes 1, 2, and Act IV, scenes 1, 2; after which he leaves and does not reappear. He could easily portray the *medicus* in Act V, scenes 4, 5, and Messenio for the rest of the play. The *medicus* leaves the stage at 956 and after a monologue of nine verses by Menaechmus I could reappear as Messenio (966) for the remainder of the action.

THIRD ACTOR: Erotium, *Ancilla*, and *Matrona*, three female rôles, would form a more appropriate combination and make changes easier than the distribution proposed by Schmidt, Fowler, Moseley-Hammond,⁹ who arrange a combination of male and female rôles. Erotium appears in the last two scenes of Act I and in the third scene of Act II. She could play the rôle of the *ancilla* in the third scene of Act III, the only appearance of this character, and return as Erotium in Act IV, Scene 3.

A monologue by Menaechmus II of ten verses (548-58) would give enough time for the change to *matrona*, who performs in the first and second scenes of Act IV. Before the final appearance of Erotium in the third scene of Act IV there is a monologue of seven verses by Menaechmus I which would furnish enough time to permit the change from *matrona* to Erotium; and a monologue of five verses by Menaechmus I at the end of this scene would enable Erotium to reappear as *matrona* in the first and second scenes of Act V after which no female character is used in the action.

FOURTH ACTOR: Cylindrus, *Senex*, Menaechmus I in the final scene. It is obvious that Cylindrus could play the rôle of the *senex* because the cook does not take part in the action after the second scene of Act II and the *senex* does not enter until the second scene of Act V. He rushes off stage (996) without waiting for the *lorarii* and Menaechmus I and does not appear again. This would leave ample time for him to make the necessary changes to enable him to play the rôle of Menaechmus I in the recognition scene.

PAUL G. MOORHEAD

Louisiana State University

NOTES

¹ The text used is that of Lindsay, W. M. T. *Macci Plauti Comediae*, (Oxford, 1903), 2 vols.

² Rambo, Eleanor F., "The Significance of the Wing-Entrances in Roman Comedy," *C.P.*, X (1915) 421. Cf. Duckworth, G.E., *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton, 1952) 85 f., 149.

³ Beare, W., *The Roman Stage* (London, 1950) 181.

⁴ See also 511 ff., 514.

⁵ From verse 600 to 665 repeated references are made to the *palla*. It is Menaechmus I's first appearance after his exit at 216. He vehemently denies any connection with his wife's robe until his admission that he lent it to Erotium (657).

⁶ The evidence for and against the use of masks in the time of Plautus is inconclusive; but, disregarding this, a single actor for the two rôles would insure a more realistic performance, mask or no mask. A single stature, voice, *et cetera* would be dramatically more perfect to an audience than if it were necessary to make mental adjustments at each entrance of the Menaechmi. But Miss M. Bieber, *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater* (Princeton, 1939) 310, states: "Both of these plays, (*Amphitruo* and *Menaechmi*) however, are inconceivable without the Greek and Southern Italian masked and stereotyped costume, since only with the typical disguise and complete covering of face and body are such interchanges of indistinguishable brothers made possible." Beare, *op. cit.*, 178, says, "I follow Navarre in holding that the Roman stage-convention was based on the Greek — even with regard to the use

of masks." A brief summary of the evidence on the use of masks can be found in Duckworth, *op. cit.*, 92 ff. Schmidt, Fr., *Ueber die Zahl der Schauspieler bei Plautus und Terenz* (Erlangen, 1870) 22, does not think that the two rôles can be played by one actor because (1) the twins are on the stage together in the final scene, (2) the two rôles would be too much for one actor, (3) no proper means of identification are provided for the audience to distinguish one brother from the other.

⁷ The comedy does have at least one definite vacant stage at 882. Menaechmus II leaves the stage at 881 and the *senex*, who went to summon the doctor at 875, returns at 882. According to the old man's words, considerable time has been consumed in waiting for the doctor to return from his calls; yet there are only five verses to fill the time-gap. Perhaps some sort of by-play (*chorou*) could take place here by the sailors who came on stage with Menaechmus II and Messenio at the beginning of Act II (cf. 350) and were conducted to an inn by Messenio (436, 445, 986). They could appear here for some *entracte* boisterous play and perhaps at two other places (700, 1049) as they walk about "to see the town."

⁸ The house of Menaechmus I is on the spectators' right (96).

⁹ Schmidt, *op. cit.*, 56:

I. Menaechmus I.

II. Menaechmus II, *Medicus*.

III. Messenio, *Peniculus*.

IV. Cylindrus, *Ancilla, Matriona*.

V. Erotium, *Senex*.

Fowler, H. N., *The Menaechmi of Plautus*, (N. Y., 1927) 22, and Moseley, N., Hammond, M., T. Macci Plauti *Menaechmi* (Camb., Mass., 1933) 18, give the same as Schmidt.

THE PHAEDRA MYTH IN FRANCE

CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP has, from the beginning, been a Janus-faced god, looking backward on the one hand to interpret the works of art in the light of the meaning for their time, but at the same time, looking forward seeking the meaning to each successive generation as it reinterprets the old stories and myths. Naturally, as in all scholarship, there is a third group which has tried to compare and evaluate the modern productions with their ancient sources. This last task doubtless *should* be mine; but in addition to being inadequate to the task after Schlegel and myriad others who have treated this same myth, I must confess at the outset that I do not believe in such value judgments which are always a matter of personal taste and frequently merely prejudice. There is, however, I believe, value both for the classicist and the student of modern literature in seeing what has become of

an ancient myth in a modern literature and what it has meant to the modern author and his audience.

It is probably unnecessary to remind the reader that France is a Latin nation: its language is, as Professor Ford used to say, modern Latin—Virgil is as much a national poet for the French as Chaucer is to a modern American. Greek, on the other hand, has somewhat the position of Latin for us: an acquired language but one which greatly influenced their own tongue (French has curious affinities with Greek noted constantly by their humanists) and the Greek concept of art has never been absent from the French literary mind. The French classical theater is the usual example of an art frankly imitative of antiquity but partly because of misinterpretations of antiquity and partly owing to the real original genius of the French writers, the result is a fusion of two civilizations, a sort of Graeco-French literature. Racine is the pre-eminent example of this Graeco-French mind. Any one of the great tragedies will show the same characteristics which we shall see in our discussion of *Phèdre*.

Racine begins the preface to his tragedy *Phèdre et Hippolyte* (this first title has a certain significance although it was later changed to simply *Phèdre*) by saying: "Here is another tragedy whose subject is taken from Euripides." This is not quite true even though Racine believed it. In plot outline and realistic tone, his play is much nearer the *Phaedra* of Seneca which he does not mention. But he continues: "If I owed him (Euripides) only the idea of the character Phèdre, I should owe him what is perhaps best in my theatre." . . . "Phèdre has all the Aristotelian qualities evoking pity and terror. She is neither completely guilty nor completely innocent, for she is involved, by her destiny, in an illegitimate passion which is more horrible to her than to anyone else; she would rather die than confess it to anyone."

But Racine refines Euripides' Phaedra by making the nurse accuse Hippolytus, "an act unworthy of a princess," he says. It is Phaedra herself, however, rather than Artemis who finally absolves Hippolytus of any guilt after his death at the end of the play. A further refinement is that both Euripides and Seneca make the false accusation of Hippolytus one of act—that he *did* violate Phaedra; Racine has him only *want* to violate her.

The whole character of Hippolytus seemed unreal to Racine, who cites ancient critics who reproached Euripides for presenting a character exempt from imperfection. Classical scholars are not all agreed on this point and I shall speak of Hippolytus' *hybris* in a moment. Racine, therefore, gave Hippolytus a weakness—his love for Aricie, daughter of the mortal enemy of his father; which brings us to the most important change, the addition of Aricie. This very real change would almost seem to have been inspired by Phaedra's line in Seneca's play where she says, "Then I'll no rival fear." There is no evidence either way, but I like to believe that Racine read this line and said, "What if there were a rival?" At any rate, Hippolytus is no longer a devotee of Artemis, but a normal young man in love with a young girl, not at all attracted by his step-mother. Racine defends his addition, saying that he did not invent the character; that in Virgil Hippolytus did indeed marry Aricie after Esculapius had brought him back to life. As for Theseus, Racine followed Plutarch's version that the trip to Hell was in fact one with Pirithous to Epirus. Each of these changes was motivated by the desire for *vraisemblance* or realism, to make the characters and plot more believable to a French audience; for underneath the French classics unities was a compelling desire for truth to life.

Such then were the changes: the addition of a character which changes the motivation of one of the protagon-

ists; the refinement in plot action which makes the entire plot one of *wish* to sin rather than one of actual sin. There would seem to be little left of the Euripidean tragedy. Let us stop comparing for a moment and look at each one in its own setting. Euripides' play, the second one he wrote on the same subject, is considered by many as his most perfect play. Hippolytus is a true tragic hero, a victim of *hybris*, overweening pride in his own chastity which brings him to his ruin through his shocked and uncompromising attitude toward Phaedra's passion for him, a passion so abhorrent to Phaedra that she hangs herself when she realizes that Hippolytus knows of it. But beyond the human tragedy of noble characters, there is also a beautifully balanced opposition between Aphrodite irked by Hippolytus' disdain for her at the beginning of the play, vowing punishment for him through Phaedra, and Artemis at the end of the play, cleansing him of any guilt in Theseus' eyes. In short, man's life is fraught with human conflict of his own making, but also the jealous gods have their part in his destiny.

In seventeenth century Christian France, Racine, in his own way, produces a profound human tragedy. The realization of a successful rival drives Phèdre to accept Oenone's solution against her own moral judgment. But, as I said earlier, the concept of sin in Racine's play is not one of sin in fact, but one of sin by desire. This is the austere, puritanical concept of the Jansenist *milieu* in which Racine was reared. In the preface to the play again, Racine clearly states the moral tone of the play and according to some historians this play brought about his reconciliation with Jansenist Port-Royal and his renunciation of the theater. Phèdre has been termed "the woman with a Jansenist conscience." Artistically too, it is one of the best constructed and poetic of the masterpieces of the French classical theater, a climactic conflict drawn tight and untied with profound psychological

realism. The individualized characters are balanced against each other to make an artistic and human tragedy. (I do not even mention here the consummate beauty of Racine's sonorous alexandrines.)

On the basis of this sort of comparison, I think we may say fairly that these two plays fill somewhat the same position in their separate civilizations: parallel in spiritual and artistic qualities but different in detail. In other words Racine made the Phaedra myth French. The myth continues to exist in France on two separate levels, each of which has its own growth and vitality. To prove my point, I should like to illustrate the life of the Graeco-French myth or the Phaedra story according to Racine.

In the summer of 1952 two *Phaedras* were being presented in Paris; neither one was Euripides', although there were Greek plays being presented at the time, nor was either really Racine. The first was a ballet—not new, for it was the nineteenth presentation. Jean Cocteau did the choreography for the ballet and prefaced his outline of the dance with these words:

A myth is a myth because the poets take it up again and keep it from dying.

No one must be ignorant of the myth about Phaedra, grand-daughter of the Sun;

By word or by dance, let us glorify this myth!

The story danced by the *corps de ballet* with Serge Lifar as Hippolytus is essentially that of Racine, made mobile by the requirements of the art form, staged and danced with classic simplicity. There is one curious change: at the end, three mythical personages appear; a god and two human creatures. The god is not Artemis as in Euripides' play, but her twin brother Apollo who shoots an arrow symbolic of his conquest over darkness. Then Minos and Pasiphae, Phaedra's parents, come forward so that the mother can cover her dead daughter's body with her red cloak. The ballet required a simple well-known symbol at the end

to say visually what Artemis said so beautifully in Euripides' words; but in following the Racinian version, there was no plastic symbol to explain Hippolytus' innocence and one had to be supplied. And the myth has once again evolved in what would almost seem at first a return to the Greek concept of the myth.

The second Phaedra in Paris in 1952 was a play *Phèdre ou l'Esprit de Famille* by Jean Canolle. It is not a great play, but its interpretation of the Phaedra myth is, I believe, significant even beyond the value of the play itself; the myth has become a comedy! It is once again the Graeco-French myth, that is, Canolle utilizes the Racinian characters but "Phaedra has become a piquant young blonde more naturally attracted by the muscular young man about town than by the wily old 'has-been'." Aricie is what the French call "une femme de tête;" Hippolytus is a blond Olympic runner who worries more about his form on the track than feminine wiles (Euripides again). Thérémène, Hippolytus' confidential servant in Racine, is a peace-at-any-price civil servant. On his return, Theseus discovers that Hippolytus has succumbed to Phaedra's tricks, but with some surprise he also discovers that Phaedra detests him. Does he kill his wife or his rival? No indeed! He merely goes off on other exploits, leaving the young people to solve things as best they can. In the only noble words of the play, Aricie finally makes Hippolytus see the light by a sort of transposition of the pure form he understands and admires in athletics to the plane of human love. Left alone at the end of the play, but with complete insouciance, Phaedra settles for Thérémène, the only man left around loose, and he is not averse to such means of advancement.

This version of the Phaedra myth would, I think, make little sense to Euripides or Racine. It makes sense only to a twentieth century, post-Second World War civilization. Gone are the gods, gone the problem of con-

science, gone any belief worth dying for; hence, no one dies—everyone finds a neat and, on the whole, tawdry solution. But the force of the irony is tremendously magnified as the audience is capable of juxta-posing Canolle's play with that of Racine, and beyond that the *Hippolytus* of Euripides. In itself, the play is perhaps "good-humored comedy" as one critic said, but in the light of the traditional myth it is an arresting commentary on the spiritual values of the twentieth century.

As I said at the outset, I can draw no moral, make no value judgments except to say that somehow the Phaedra myth has meaning for all sorts of civilizations. Despite changes, almost deformations, the basic story is as dynamic today as it was in the seventeenth century, as it was to Seneca, to Euripides. Despite our inability to know and judge absolutely, we have a common symbol, a basic artistic language which we all recognize. As we see what various times have done to this common legend, so may we more richly understand both the original legend and the particular age which is interpreting it. As Cocteau said: "the myth lives because it is retold." When literary men cease to tell the myths of Greece, then indeed shall we have lost all hope of mutual understanding, even communication.

RUTH MULHAUSER

Western Reserve University

LATIN PAYS OFF

\$1,000 to be exact. This was the grand prize for the correct answer to the climax question on Groucho Marx's TV Show, "You Bet Your Life," (Sept. 17, 1953): What is the name of the ancient road extending southeast of Rome for some 127 miles? Each of two competing couples got it right. Even Groucho seemed impressed. Easy, Mr. G., for any First-year Latin student. One couple's successful bid for the finals resulted from familiarity with Roman numerals. G was not among them.

LATIN HITS THE ROAD

Sometime last May the following editorial appeared in *The Milwaukee Journal*, relayed from Dr. and Mrs. Carroll W. Osgood of Wauwatosa, by Mrs. Ruth O. Denning of Washington:

MAGNA VIA

Horrescimus referentes actionem contra bonum publicum. Ecce itineris rapidi quadragiesimi quarti nomen ignatum [sic] praemio et praestanti munere — "Magna Via." Quantilla prudentia mundus regitur.

Hoc pugnus et calcibus, manibus pedibusque, unguibus et rostro resistimus. Tantus dolor iram indomitam excitat. Urbs nostra adhuc puro pectore angues in herba nunc habet. Exsecrati sint!

In American (freely translated), nuts to the prize winning idea of hanging a Latin tag on the 44th st. expressway in Milwaukee, Wis., in A.D. (Anno Domini) 1953.

A professor emeritus of the Harvard medical school living in Brookline, Mass., a week or so later replied:

Gaudeo magnopere commentarium vestrum de Magna Via videns; propterea quod Latine scriptus est. Haud enim vobis consentire possum linguam illam nobilem splendidamque reprehendentibus. Bostoniae vero multa aedificia publica viaeque multae nomina habent Latina atque saepe inter nos lingua illa colloquimur. Nolite, precor igitur, diutius objurgare; gaudeat autem potius vosmet ipsi veram culturam denique in vestram pulchram urbem Fortibus-cum Bostoniensibus penetravisse!

ROBERTUS MONTRAVILLIUS VIRIDIS.

Dr. Green, you are a brave man!

SAUCE FOR THE GANDER

The time may be at hand to investigate the investigators. Last winter a House Committee, in the midst of its inquiry about subversives among philanthropic foundations, summoned among others a member of the U.S. Office of Education. The expert was asked whether he thought modern trustees might be using charitable funds to further communism. His reply, as given in Washington's *Evening Star* (Dec. 19, 1953), was most certainly garbled, but it may very well illustrate the type of inaccuracy characteristic of some in high places. He had no knowledge about the question asked by the committee, but he gave them this historical insight on the matter:

... as far back as 65 B.C. charitable trusts got so saucy they helped Cataline [sic] plot against the Roman government. Cicero, a kind of one-man investigator of the Roman Senate, exposed Cataline and persuaded the Senate to break up the charitable foundations.

The Committee Counsel made this comment: "Then we are not in an unchartered field."

Further comment by this department would be uncharitable.

JFL

THE EDITOR *loquens* DICENDA TACENDA

Contributions

IN GENERAL reasonably brief papers with a minimum of pedantic impedimenta but of competent scholarship are welcome. We must consider reader interest, especially with a preponderance of secondary school subscribers — though some of these have no small attainments and would not be content with nothing beyond classroom devices. The exceptional length of one paper in this issue is justified by: the fact that the author is one of our elder statesmen, for whom this is the last of a series printed mostly in *CJ* on a far from dry theme; his marked loyalty to CAMWS, despite great distances involved in attending meetings; the fact that he has been our benefactor in ways his modesty precludes my stating. But as a rule articles appropriate to *TAPA* are not necessarily in order in the *Classical Journal*.

Mechanics

MY PREDECESSOR said that even a good MS might well take an hour in preparing it for the printer. The demands are much greater in the case of poor MSS; and it is not surprising if, under pressure to get copy in and doing this work along with a full teaching schedule, an editor gives precedence to papers in proper form.

Though the following directions are superfluous to many contributors and involve repetition, they are still needed. The whole, notes as well, double-spaced and with ample margins. (I have one MS single-spaced on *both* sides of the paper!) All notes at the end; foot-notes and those inserted between lines immediately after the reference are in themselves respectable, but involve for us a long scissors and paste job and a chopped up MS. Abbreviations where

possible, Arabic rather than Roman numerals as a rule (separated by periods rather than commas in a series constituting one reference), substitution of parenthetical numbers in the body of the article for many brief notes — each requiring a line, avoidance of cumbersome circumlocutions and tedious repetitions (as of names, when there really are such words as 'he' and 'his'), omission (in the modern manner) of commas around 'of course' etc. — such practices as these will cut down the space required and also improve the style. (What the *Reader's Digest* can do with an article is significant.) It costs \$12-16 a page to print your contribution (without any *pro rata* of the expenses of the Secretary's office, necessary in the distribution of the *Journal*). Words to be italicized underlined once of course; but do not put quotes around the underlined. And longer quotations, to be set in smaller type and indented, should not have quotes. Your name, not under the title but at the end of the paper proper (right) with school (left) before the notes if any. If your typewriter ribbon no longer distinguishes 'o' and 'e' etc., please do something about it to save work here. Transliterate or translate Greek (in our present lack of such type); avoid *both* a foreign phrase and its translation usually. If your article falls into natural divisions, indicate them by extra space or numerals. The editor may want to put in sub-heads or distinguish transitions by type-changes or both. (Our present 9 pt. type is clearer than previous 10 pt.; and even the 7 pt. with its leading is readily legible.) Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated; for at best there is an enormous amount of manual labor for the editor in all this — though on occasion he even uses his mind.

ST. AUGUSTINE AND THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

WHY WRITE ABOUT ST. AUGUSTINE fifteen centuries after his death, when not only his own Roman civilization but also the ensuing medieval culture has passed away, and when still a third civilization, our modern commercial era, seems to many to be drawing to a lurid close? One of his books, the *Confessions*, has been more read than any other Latin classic except Virgil's *Aeneid*, and scholars have filled many library shelves with studies of his other best-known book, the *City of God*. Is there an even more vital reason for reading him?

If we think that man has a nobler side, consisting of his intellect and conscience, and that this side is what makes him human, then St. Augustine has something to say to us. A distinguished historian of medieval and modern thought, Etienne Gilson in his essay "The Breakdown of Modern Philosophy," tells us that Western culture is dying today wherever this nobler side of man has been forgotten; ethics and metaphysics are abandoned, man is treated as simply an ingenious animal, subject to physical laws alone, and *Der Fuehrer*, who knows very well how to handle bestial men, makes his appearance. Now what St. Augustine gives us—in contrast to the totalitarians who reduce man to a mere body—is a vigorous assertion of the dignity of human nature, in the individual and in society.

St. Augustine's philosophy is a sane remedy for contemporary aberrations because it was based on a sane and holy life. St. Augustine was neither a pietistic man, nor, as he is sometimes pictured, the harsh damner of the human race to eternal perdition; but an intense African with a passionate love of physical, even carnal, beauty, and a yet more passionate love of truth. Born in 354 in Tagaste and brought up in the rich Latin culture of Carthage, he early showed his sensitive and fiery tempera-

ment. In his *Confessions* we read of his fondness for games and dislike of studies, his terror at the prospect of a whipping (and his enduring sympathy with a child's fears of punishment), his theft of some pears simply 'for the devil of it,' his later love of literature, the years of his profligate loves in Carthage. Two stabilizing experiences of this brilliant, impulsive student stand out: his love for the girl who became the mother of his child, Adeodatus, and to whom, although not married, he was faithful for fifteen years; and his intoxication with wisdom and determination to devote his life to the pursuit of it upon reading, in his nineteenth year, Cicero's work in praise of philosophy, the *Hortensius*.

Henceforth, although Augustine earned his livelihood as a teacher of rhetoric in various cities of the Empire, the story of his life becomes largely the internal drama of his pursuit of wisdom. He passed through the queer doctrines of Manichaeism, which appealed to him because it claimed to prove its theories to the reason and because it absolved man of moral responsibility for his misdeeds, to the skepticism of the New Academy. From these relativists of the ancient world he was rescued by the neo-Platonists with their distinction between the sensible and intelligible orders: although there seems to be nothing stable and permanent in the world we perceive by our senses, there are immutable truths of the intellect, such as the truths of mathematics. This distinction gave Augustine a new understanding of the God of Christianity as non-material substance, spiritual substance, and he was soon intellectually convinced of the truth of Christianity by the sermons of the learned St. Ambrose in Milan—for St. Augustine had never forgotten the teachings of his Christian mother, St. Monica, about his Saviour and the Redemption, and could not long remain satisfied with the purely abstract neo-Platonism.

But having found what he had been searching for — a philosophy, a wisdom, which was indeed a Way of Life — Augustine hesitated to embrace it. Not without a fierce moral struggle, which had a telling influence upon his theology of grace, did he overcome his old desires for sexual pleasure and glory as a rhetorician, and, in 386 in the memorable scene in the garden in Milan, surrender his heart to his King.

After a saintly career as priest and bishop, he died in 430 in the tragic times of the Vandal invasion when he saw the administrative work of his lifetime swept away; saw, to paraphrase the words of his fifth century biographer, Possidius, "cities destroyed, and inhabitants put to the sword or scattered, churches destitute of priests, virgins scattered, some killed, some serving their conquerors, having lost integrity both of body and soul and faith . . . with only three of innumerable churches left standing." But the familiar narrative of his conversion should help us understand that part of his work which has survived the wreckage of civilizations, his philosophy and theology — for all that he tells us has been hammered out on the forge of his own deepest experience, rests upon his penetrating observation of his own nature.

As suggested in the beginning of this paper, St. Augustine in his philosophy gives us a theory of human nature which transcends bestiality, and a theory of society which allows for other elements than force alone.

First, his theory of human nature. Man consists of (1) body, (2) soul, including intellect and conscience, and (3) a mystical part of the soul capable of receiving God's grace. The soul is superior to the body because knowing, one of its functions, is higher than the other two functions of human nature that Augustine distinguishes, existing (like stones) and living (like animals). Knowing is highest because it implies the other two. Now of the two parts of knowing, viz., sense perception and rea-

soning about the data of the senses, reasoning is the higher because it judges and distinguishes the senses. Thus reason is the highest faculty of the soul. Moreover, the highest thing attainable by reason is truth, for truth, in that it is immutable, necessary, and eternal (for example, the truths of mathematics) is seen to be independent of the intellect which reaches it.

Truth is transcendent — and here, at the crown of man's intellectual activity, man can, if not touch God, at least rationally infer His existence. For the characteristics of truth — immutability, necessity, and eternity — come neither from material things nor from the intellect, but are the proper characteristics of Truth itself, Truth which we do not judge but find as something apart from and above us — the Truth which is God. Thus is human nature raised above the animals in its possession of reason, and linked to God by bearing in its reason a divine sign, truth. St. Augustine has something to say to our contemporaries who believe that propaganda of any kind will satisfy man's capacity and craving for truth.

Human nature thus far, however, may seem admirable but rather cold. But, St. Augustine goes on to say, the purpose of exercising the reason is not primarily to learn mathematical truths, but to achieve happiness — and this we do by making a good use of our knowledge, by choosing the right object toward which to turn our thought. The good over the true, the will over the intellect, these are characteristic Augustinian theses.

The role of the will is to turn thought toward its true object, the Divine and universal, constraining it to use knowledge of created things as a means to this end. This program — knowledge of the Divine as the end, knowledge of created things as the means — laid down in St. Augustine's "Concerning Christian Teaching," led, incidentally, to the liberal arts being taken into the program of Christian education, as

ancillary to a proper understanding of the Scriptures. The divine things toward which thought ought to be directed are the moral truths and virtues, which, like the theoretical truths, are immutable. But unlike the theoretical truths, these moral truths are not discovered in a pre-established divine order. Rather, man must himself establish the divine order by *willing* the virtuous action.

The will is free to choose—and yet it is unable to choose the virtuous action without undergoing the influence of grace. No doctrine of St. Augustine's has been more discussed than this; about no other teaching of his has there been more controversy, with such champions as Pelagius on the side of extreme free will and the Protestant Reformers and Jansenists supporting an over-ruling grace. Yet we must accept the paradox as St. Augustine has given it to us—not distinguishing the problem of free choice from the existence of the will, he never resolved it. For Augustine the human will, although corrupted by original sin and incapable of good without the help of grace, is still a great good, the source of our moral freedom and another distinguishing mark between man and the animals.

Thus St. Augustine in his view of man is neither a fatalist nor a drifting devotee of the expedient. For him human nature is dignified by its ability to attain truth by the reason and good by the will. Moreover, even unredeemed human nature, like every other created nature, is good; for it was made by God Who declared His works good. Evil is simply deficiency—so Augustine defines in a lasting philosophical formula the classical Christian optimism about man and the world.

And for human society, too, there is hope, as St. Augustine shows in that most influential of his books, which, by a queer quirk, became the bible of a world empire.

The central message of the *City of*

God is the reality of two mystical societies, one based on a good will, the other on an evil will: "Two loves have [from before the beginning of the world] built two cities—the love of self, even unto the contempt of God, the earthly city; the love of God, even unto the contempt of self, the heavenly city." In the relentless warfare between these two cities, only roughly to be identified with Church and State, there is no doubt as to which will gain the final victory. As for the particular secular states, citizens of the City of God, while in this world, obey their laws and benefit by their domestic peace; but these citizens recognize the temporal limitations of the secular state and its moral indifference—for the secular state is not founded in justice, as Cicero thought, but only in a common will, whether that will be toward good or evil. The only true society is the City of God, symbolized by the Church, for its foundation is the only lasting one, the will of God.

In addition to this splendid affirmation of the existence in this world of a spiritual kingdom proof against ephemeral brutality and tyranny, St. Augustine includes in the *City of God* elements from which later ages constructed an influential theory of the Christian state. J. N. Figgis, in *The Political Aspects of St. Augustine's "City of God,"* shows how in the Middle Ages the City of God was identified with the Holy Roman Empire, how there developed the ideal of a Christian Empire from which unbelievers would be excluded and in which two balanced powers, the secular and spiritual, would rule; and he traces the survival of this ideal, with the Erastian subordination of the spiritual power, in the various national states after the Reformation. Today the medieval notion of the Christian state as founded in righteousness, together with those other Augustinian theories of a harmonious world of small, equal states, and of a natural moral law for nations, makes a melan-

choly contrast with twentieth century absolutism and lust for power.

And yet these notions of a decent, humane society, of man's capacity for truth and his moral freedom, are no more forgotten than is St. Augustine himself. While many are crying out that men are simply aspects of nature whose whole duty is, without thought of self-restraint, to manipulate and be manipulated, to destroy and be destroyed, and while evil men are carrying out these ill-conceived theories, St. Augustine calls us to look to the deeper things within ourselves. His ideas remain keen and effective instruments against tyranny, a kind of armory of Christian wisdom which must be, humanly speaking at least, one source of our hopes for a brighter future.

Nor did St. Augustine himself, of all men, overlook the qualification "humanly speaking." It is well to recall, before leaving the great Bishop of Hippo, that the foundation of his ideas and the fundamental refutation of skepticism beyond all *si fallor, sum* formulas was the act of faith: *nisi credideritis, non intelligetis*. He too looked to Bethlehem and Calvary, and thence came the strength and the saneness of his thought, thence his true wisdom.

GEORGE SANDERLIN

University of Maine

BACCHUS (from page 110)

- ²⁵ Pausanias i. 21, 2.
- ²⁶ Athenaeus xiii. 604 d, citing Ion.
- ²⁷ Athenaeus xiii. 604 d, citing Ion.
- ²⁸ Plutarch *Pericles* v. 4; Plutarch rejects such a notion.
- ²⁹ Athenaeus x. 429 a.
- ³⁰ Plato *Symposium* 177 e.
- ³¹ Aristophanes *Knights* 524-534.
- ³² Some hold, sic G. Murray, *Aristophanes and His Art* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1933), pp. 18, 102, that in this play Cratinus recanted. He represented Comedy as his true wife scolding him for his infidelities with Drunkenness. The dénouement, however, is uncertain. Kock, *Com. Att. Frag.* I, 70. Cf. also G. Norwood, *Greek Comedy* (London, Methuen, 1930), 117.
- ³³ Horace *Epistles* i. 19, 1-3.
- ³⁴ A reminiscence of Epicharmus, *supra*, note 22.
- ³⁵ Athenaeus ii. 39 c.
- ³⁶ Loc. cit.
- ³⁷ Aristophanes *Peace* 700-703.
- ³⁸ Kock III, 496.

- ³⁹ Athenaeus ii. 39 d.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.* i. 23 a.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.* ii. 44 d.
- ⁴² Athenaeus ii. 44 a.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.* ii. 35 d.
- ⁴⁴ Loc. cit.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.* ii. 40 a.
- ⁴⁶ Simonides' predilection for the vine, however, did not prevent his satirizing Timocreon for his tippling, *Lyra Graeca* (Loeb) II. 345.
- ⁴⁷ Athenaeus I. 32 c.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.* ii. 40 c.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.* xi. 472 f - 473 a.
- ⁵⁰ Athenaeus xi. 473 a-b.
- ⁵¹ For the winebibbing of Anacreon see notes 95-97.
- ⁵² *Lyra Graeca*, Anacreon, 18.
- ⁵³ *Greek Anthology* vii. 28.
- ⁵⁴ *Infra* note 96.
- ⁵⁵ *Greek Anthology* xvi. 306, 307; Pausanias i. 25, 1.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.* vii. 23, 24, 26, 27, 31.
- ⁵⁷ I.e., the Chorus of Dionysus composed of the Elders who are to have charge of training the young man and children, *Laus* 665-666 (*passim*).
- ⁵⁸ Plato *Laus* 666 c.
- ⁵⁹ *Symposiacs* vii. 10, 2.
- ⁶⁰ *Greek Anthology* ix. 406.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.* xi. 20.
- ⁶² *Ibid.* vii. 415.
- ⁶³ Horace *Epistles* i. 19, 7.
- ⁶⁴ xxxi. 25, 4.
- ⁶⁵ Nothing has survived by which one may judge these literary efforts.
- ⁶⁶ Horace *Odes* iii. 21, 13-14.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.* *Epistles* i. 5, 19.
- ⁶⁸ Catullus 27.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 50.
- ⁷⁰ Tibullus iii. 6, 19-21.
- ⁷¹ Propertius iv. 6, 75-76.
- ⁷² Tibullus i. 2, 1-3; i. 5, 38; iii. 6, 4; Propertius iii. 17, 4; Ovid *Heroides* 16, 231; *Remedium Amoris* 805.
- ⁷³ Tibullus i. 6, 19; i. 10, 32; Horace *Odes* iii. 6, 25; Ovid *Amores* i. 4, 28-54.
- ⁷⁴ Tibullus i. 6, 19; i. 10, 32. Cf. Ovid *Amores* i. 4, 20; ii. 5, 17-18; *Ars Amatoria* i. 500, 571; *Heroides* 17, 87.
- ⁷⁵ Tibullus i. 9, 59-62.
- ⁷⁶ Propertius iii. 3, 48.
- ⁷⁷ *Ibid.* iii. 10, 21-26.
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid.* iv. 8, 29-62.
- ⁷⁹ *De Tranquillitate Animi* xvii. 8-11. Cf. Plato *Phaedrus* 245 a.
- ⁸⁰ Reproduced in Howe and Harrer, *Roman Literature in Translation* (Harper and Brothers, New York, 1924), 536.
- ⁸¹ Martial xii. 40.
- ⁸² *Ibid.* xi. 6.
- ⁸³ *Ibid.* iii. 68, 5.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid.* iv. 82, 6; xi. 17; x. 19, 12-21. Cf. *infra*, note 89.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid.* xi. 15.
- ⁸⁶ Ausonius v. 21, 7-9.
- ⁸⁷ *Ibid.* ix. 2, 6-8.
- ⁸⁸ H. G. E. White, ed., *Ausonius* (New York, Putnam's Sons, 1919), I. 356.
- ⁸⁹ Pliny *Epistles* iii. 21.
- ⁹⁰ The late Professor H. R. Brush suggested that the enthusiasm of ancient writers for wine may be but "the exuberance of the pagan spirit."
- ⁹¹ Whether the *Bacchants* shows Euripides to have recanted or not is a moot question. Probably the poet knew a good plot when he saw it.
- ⁹² Aulus Gellius vi. 16, 7.
- ⁹³ Athenaeus xiv. 616 a.
- ⁹⁴ Aristophanes *Knights* 80-100.
- ⁹⁵ See notes 51-56. Cf. Critias' prophecy that Anacreon will be popular as long as lads serve wine and deal bumpers around, Edmonds, *Elegy and Iambus* (Loeb series) I. Critias 7.
- ⁹⁶ Athenaeus x. 429 b, cited by Stemplinger, Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, R-E s.v. Horatius, VIII, 2349.

⁹⁷ A modern parallel of one writing under a pose is that of Barrie and his *My Lady Nicotine*. In this book he makes himself out to be a nicotine addict though he "was just smoking his first pipe." (James Barrie, Introduction to his *My Lady Nicotine*). He wrote so convincingly that Sir Robert Donald, speaking of Barrie's life at the time of his writing the nicotine articles, describes him as an inveterate smoker (John A. Hammerton, *Barrie: the Story of a Genius* [New York, Dodd, Mead, 1930], 154-155). Professor G. O. Arlt calls attention to another example of literary posing in the German erotic school of the Eighteenth Century, citing particularly the anacreontics of Ludwig Gleim. Cf. Hermann Kluge, *Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur* (ed. 56; Altenburg, Oscar Bonde, 1931), 98; Robert Koenig, *Deutsche Literatur Geschichte* (ed. 32; Bielefeld and Leipzig, Velhagen and Klasing, 1910), I, 283-286; Stemplinger, who says of Gleim that he was always singing of wine but drank none (*op. cit.*, *supra*, note 96, VIII, 2349).

- ⁹⁸ *Anacreontics* 21, (Bergk).
⁹⁹ *Ibid.* 8.
¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* 48.
¹⁰¹ *Ibid.* 58.
¹⁰² Athenaeus ii. 43 f.
¹⁰³ *Greek Anthology* vii. 452.
¹⁰⁴ *Supra*, notes 8-10.
¹⁰⁵ *Lyra Graeca*, Alcaeus 72.
¹⁰⁶ *Lyra Graeca*, Alcaeus 82.
¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.* Alcaeus 156.
¹⁰⁸ *Supra*, note 22.
¹⁰⁹ Norwood, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, note 32), 106-107; Kaibel, Ed., *Com. Graec. Frag.* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1899), I, 1.250.
¹¹⁰ Norwood, *op. cit.*, see note 32.
¹¹¹ Athenaeus ii. 36 c-d.
¹¹² *Loc. cit.*
¹¹³ When she drank wine, she would do so daintily, (Athenaeus xi. 463 e).
¹¹⁴ *Supra*, notes 13-14.
¹¹⁵ Athenaeus xi. 782 d.
¹¹⁶ Athenaeus ii. 40 f.
¹¹⁷ *Ibid.* ii. 39 e-f.
¹¹⁸ *Supra*, note 17.
¹¹⁹ *Anthologica Lyrica*, Theognis, 873-876 (Bergk).
¹²⁰ Eratosthenes *Catasterismos* 24.
¹²¹ Plato *Cratylus* 406 c.
¹²² Athenaeus v. 179 e, quoting Homer, *Odyssey* xiv. 463-466.
¹²³ *Etymologicon Magnum*, s.v. oinos.
¹²⁴ Plato *Laws* 671 b.
¹²⁵ *Lysis* 204 d.
¹²⁶ Plato *Laws* 666 b.
¹²⁷ Cf. *supra*, notes 57-58.
¹²⁸ *Republic* 363 d.
¹²⁹ *Odyssey* ix. 8.
¹³⁰ *Republic* 390 a-b.
¹³¹ *Laws* 666 b.
¹³² *Loc. cit.*
¹³³ *Laws* 671 de 674 a-c; *Minos* 320 a b.
¹³⁴ Pseudo-Aristotle *Problemata* xi. 38, 903 b.
¹³⁵ *Politics* VII. 15.9.1336 b.
¹³⁶ *Nic. Eth.* ii. 6.13-14.1106b; ii. 9.3-6.1109a-b.
¹³⁷ *Op. cit.*, ii. 9.4.
¹³⁸ Athenaeus xii. 548 d, citing Clearchus.
¹³⁹ *Cyropaedia* i. 2. 8.
¹⁴⁰ *Hiero* vi. 3.
¹⁴¹ *To Demonicus* 32.
¹⁴² *To Nicocles* 29; *Panathenaicus* 31; *To Demonicus* 21.
¹⁴³ Pytheas, in Athenaeus ii. 44 e-f; The Pseudo-Plutarch *Lives of the Ten Orators*; Demosthenes 848 c; Demosthenes *False Embassy* 46; *Philippics* ii. 30; Philostratus *Lives of the Sophists* 508.
¹⁴⁴ Stobaeus *Florilegium* (Meineke, II, 18).
¹⁴⁵ Cf., however, Idomeneus' scandalous story of Demosthenes' getting drunk, (Athenaeus xiii, 592 f); the story of the orator's getting caught in a tavern, (Diogenes Laertius vi. 34); and the Pseudo-Plutarch's report that Demosthenes frequently took part in revels (*Lives of the Ten Orators*, Demosthenes 847 e).

- ¹⁴⁶ *Rules for the Preservation of Health*, 6.
¹⁴⁷ Lucian *Double Indictment* 15.
¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.* *The Parasite* 16.
¹⁴⁹ Plutarch *Timoleon* xv. 4.
¹⁵⁰ Note, however, the gibe of Philoxenus who, having been sent to the quarries for an intrigue at court and having been restored to the tyrant's good graces, being treated by Dionysius to an audition of his poetry and being asked what he thought of it, said: "Take me back to the quarries." (Diodorus xv. 6, 3). Cf. Athenaeus i. 6 f.
¹⁵¹ *Symposiacs* vii. 10. Cf. *supra*, note 59.
¹⁵² *Op. cit.*, i. 5, 2.
¹⁵³ Philostratus *Lives of the Sophists* 586.
¹⁵⁴ Stobaeus *Florilegium* (Meineke I. 136).
¹⁵⁵ *Lucretius* iii. 476-483.
¹⁵⁶ Cicero *De Senectute* xiii.
¹⁵⁷ *Tusculan Disputations* v. 35, 100.
¹⁵⁸ "The Wine Element in Horace," C. J. XLII. 161-168:229-236.
¹⁵⁹ Vergil *Georgics* ii. 454.
¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.* ii. 455.
¹⁶¹ *Aeneid* ii. 265.
¹⁶² *Ibid.*, vii. 385-405.
¹⁶³ Suetonius *On Poets*, Vergil 9.
¹⁶⁴ G. A. Simcox, *A History of Latin Literature* (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1883) I, 334.
¹⁶⁵ Tibullus ii. 3, 68.
¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.* i. 2, 1.
¹⁶⁷ Propertius i. 16, 5.
¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.* i. 3, 9. Cf. also *supra*, note 78.
¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.* ii. 33, 27-28.
¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.* ii. 33, 29-33.
¹⁷¹ Ovid *Art of Love* i. 589.
¹⁷² Ovid *Ars Amatoria* i. 246.
¹⁷³ Pseudo-Aristotle, *Problemata* xxx. 1, 953 b, had already issued a similar warning on the use of wine: "For wine induces us to kiss those who are so unprepossessing in appearance or age that no one sober would kiss them."
¹⁷⁴ Ovid *Ars Amatoria* i. 589.
¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.* *Remedia Amoris* 809-810.
¹⁷⁶ *Ex Ponto* i. 10, 30, so accepted by G. A. Simcox, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, note 164), I, 334, 367.
¹⁷⁷ For two items commendatory of Bacchus as patron of the arts, see the citations from the Pseudo-Tibullus and Propertius, *supra*, notes 70-71.
¹⁷⁸ Petronius *Satyricon* 88.
¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 5.
¹⁸⁰ Quintilian xii. 1, 8.
¹⁸¹ *Ibid.* i. 11, 2.
¹⁸² *Ibid.* xii. 2, 30.
¹⁸³ Quintilian xi. 3, 27.
¹⁸⁴ *Epigrams* x. 47, 9.
¹⁸⁵ *Correspondence*, Vol. II, p. 64, Loeb Series.
¹⁸⁶ *Augustan History*, Three Gordians xx. 6.
¹⁸⁷ *Anthologia Latina* 258 a (Riese).
¹⁸⁸ *Supra*, notes 86-88.
¹⁸⁹ Ausonius v. 15, 9.
¹⁹⁰ But cf. *supra*, notes 2-20.
¹⁹¹ Note, however, the contrast between the Bacchic emotions observable in Arabic and Classic wine poetry, e.g., "The wine-skin is a kingdom to him who possesses it, and the kingdom therein, though small, how great it is!" H. F. Lutz, *Viticulture and Brewing in the Ancient Orient* (New York, Stechert, 1922), 144.
¹⁹² Athenaeus ii. 40 a.
¹⁹³ Unless one is to judge the profession by the drunken Fufius who went to sleep during a performance of Pacuvius' *Ilione* and missed his cue (Horace *Satires* ii. 3, 60-62).
¹⁹⁴ *Die Feste der Stadt Athen im Altertum* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1898), p. 358.
¹⁹⁵ But compare the Goths, who when they heard the cry of "meat and drink," did not take kindly to such refinements as poetical recitations. (*Anthologia Latina* 285 a Riese). Cf. F. Wrede, *Über die Sprache der Ostgoten in Italien* (Strassburg, Trubner, 1891), 141. Professor A. K. Dolch has kindly supplied this parallel.

THE REVIEW CUPBOARD

Et summis admiratio
veneratioque et
inferioribus merita
laus

Edited by Grundy Steiner

TO INTRODUCE with some unifying principle the components of the subsequent *farrago*, itself written by three hands, is almost beyond human contrivance except to note that the publishers or the authors sent them all for review in this periodical. Yet all do deserve some notice here, since, be it in whole or in slightest part, wholeheartedly or casually, they all are in some measure concerned with something that bears on Classical antiquity.

In the first section, Mr. Coutant reports about two books on Aristotle: the second section is devoted to reprints more or less slightly revised; the third, to books on Medieval and Renaissance topics; the fourth, to books calculated to facilitate the study of the Classics in, respectively, Turkey and Latin America; and the fifth, to four books which are even more peripheral and casual in their association with Classical antiquity. Two of these are summarized by Mr. Russell. G. S.

ARISTOTLE

The Philosophy of Aristotle. By D. J. ALLAN. (*Home University Library* 222.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1952. Pp. [5]. 220. \$2.00.

Aristotle's Metaphysics. Newly translated as a Postscript to Natural Science, with an analytical index of technical terms, by RICHARD HOPE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952. Pp. xvii, 394. \$5.00.

D. J. ALLAN, Reader in Ancient Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh, is fitted by long study and solid judgment to discuss even the most controversial aspects of Aristotle. One wonders what could be said in 220 pages which would be news to anyone at all versed in the traditions of western culture. This reviewer testifies to absorbed and close reading of the book. Allan is a modern who knows how to make his explanations suggest modern counterparts in the field of ideas. Yet in relating Aristotle to recent developments he does not obtrude the relationship and clearly avoids the sin of present-mindedness (cf. *Happiness — Pleasure*, p. 170, for example).

It seems inevitable that any work on Aristotle will try to show the relation of Aristotle to Plato and commit itself to one of the several views prevailing on this relationship. Allan advances the (to this reader) novel view that while Aristotle grew away from Plato's idealism, it was in a crisis of thinking over a short period of time and not in a steady progression, as

Jaeger would have it (*Aristotle*, Oxford, 1948). He also believes that a major factor in Aristotle's break-away from Plato stems from his concern for qualitative change, which concern, carried to excess in opposition to the quantitative, proved disastrous for his system of physics. At the same time Aristotle's ability to be at home with "discontinuous human experience," rather than to insist on a unifying principle, enabled him to begin the work of detailed scientific investigation in which each field had its own working principles.

A certain amount of reasonable polemic discussion in defense of Aristotle's "mistakes" is in order in such a book. Allan religiously avoids controversies for which Aristotle's text provides a springboard but offers the following considerations which limit Aristotle's culpability or show that "error" is an inapplicable word: (1) Aristotle's position on "substance" is due in part to the state of knowledge of his time, particularly the failure to reflect on the question whether categories of speech are suitable also as categories of thought in each and every case. On a certain level of abstraction it seems likely that we today must use Aristotle's language (p. 112). (2) Aristotle's logic often bears the blame for faults built into it by later thinkers. Some of the limitations are due to the field of application, namely, the area of debate. Aristotle was very well aware that the syllogism does not discover new truth. (3) The contradictions in the *Ethics* are due to the fact that it is a dynamically evolving treatise, developing and correcting, as Plato does in his dialogs. Disappointment of readers in the failure to develop the moral side of the theory is met by showing that Aristotle is concerned to define responsibility, not to indulge in metaphysical preoccupation with the problem of free-will. Those interested in education as subject-matter will be interested to note a foreshadowing of the Deweyan "We become what we do" (p. 171). To Aristotle's credit must be reckoned the fact that in founding the first extensive, organized scientific research he had to breast a current of humanistic, not to say theological, opinion.

Allan throughout gives a picture of anything but a static Aristotle. He explains Aristotle's popularity in the middle ages and later on the ground that he showed a great appreciation of the role of history, an attitude likely to endear him to Christian theologians.

Perhaps it is picayune, considering how well Allan has used his space, to find fault. Nonetheless, this reviewer would have liked to see him develop his fine treatment of the "accidental" on p. 150 to the point of indicating how the "accidental" has become the substance of much of modern science. Again, his treatment of the logic demands some acquaintance with formal logic on the part of the reader. And even if a bibliography is select, a list that includes Werner Jaeger might also have included Harold Cherniss.

Somewhat different is the case with Hope's translation. In view of the unworthy uses to which paper and ink are often put these days, no one can quarrel with the intention, announced on the jacket, to translate the *Metaphysics* once again into English, "idea by idea" rather than "word for word"; but on the other hand comparison with the Oxford Translation of W. D. Ross and the Loeb translation of H. Tredennick is unavoidable. The reader cannot fail to be impressed by the ease of reading and by the modern look of the vocabulary. In some cases the modernity may be too modern, of course (cf. "thaumazein" meaning "curiosity"). Many terms are especially attractive. In 981a1-2 we find "unified" instead of Tredennick's and Ross's "single", and *aitia* is frequently called "factor." Such practices are standard throughout the book, and do not in general do violence to the meaning.

Nonetheless, this translation should point the way to another translation rather than supersede those now available. All too often the language runs over into the freakish. We find 980a23 "sensing" instead of "sense" (T. and W.); 982a5-6 "which to know is wisdom" (T. has "whose knowledge is wisdom," and W. has "the knowledge of which is wisdom"); 993b30-31 "Status in being governs status in truth." (T. and W. have "As each thing is in respect of existence, so it is in respect of truth.") An occasional banal note intrudes: "It pays to be trained in its method" (995a13). It comes as a surprise that "tode ti" is regularly called "a this something," that gnomic aorists and imperfects are translated into the past tense. But worst of all the barriers to easy reading is the Analytical Index of Technical Terms, purporting to

give "the history of their use" (jacket). As terms occur in the text, a number follows in brackets, and this number leads to a registry of terms in the appendix in their various translations by Hope. This is hardly a "history of their use," and since such bracketed numbers interrupt the text continually, the effect on the reader is harrowing. Perhaps the purpose of the registry could have been met with the use of small superior figures.

The careful use of this text in conjunction with other translations and with the Greek text can be recommended. As sole guide to the thought of Aristotle it would be preferable to stay with one of the other versions mentioned.

VICTOR COUTANT

Central Michigan College of Education

REPRINTS and REVISIONS

A History of the Roman World 146-30 B.C. By F. B. MARSH. 2d ed. Revised by H. H. SCULLARD. London: Methuen & Co., 1953 (In America: New York: The Macmillan Company [College Dept.]) Pp. xi, 467; 5 maps. \$5.25.

THE TEXT AND INDEX of the first edition (London: Methuen, 1935. Pp. xi, 427) are reprinted virtually as they stood before. Mr. Scullard's chief contribution (and a valuable one) has been to append (pp. 403-441) a series of notes to draw attention "to the chief modern literature that has appeared since the first edition, and to the new evidence (little enough, chiefly epigraphical) that has accrued" (p. vi.). He has also, occasionally, briefly expanded Marsh's treatment of certain points. The notes are to be read only in close connection with Marsh's text; an asterisk appears in the margin near each supplemented passage. The bibliography has been increased by about two pages through the insertion of references to pertinent literature published since 1934. (This method of revision, which leaves the text unchanged but marks the passages which are modified by notes should be compared with the methods of revision represented in the books on Greek History cited in CJ 47 [1952] 196-197.)

Five Stages of Greek Religion. By GILBERT MURRAY. Boston: Beacon Press, 1952. Pp. xvii, 235. \$2.00.

Except for a special preface touching on the continuity of Greek elements in the Christian tradition (see Murray's discussion of this in *JHS* 71[1951]120-128) there is no visible textual difference between this print-

ing and the 1925 edition from the Columbia University Press. An occasional reference to then recent literature (e.g. in note on p. 172) is now badly dated. It would have been highly interesting to see what the distinguished author would have said after a quarter of a century had he been free to make a full-scale revision.

Geographical History in Greek Lands. By JOHN L. MYRES. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953. Pp. x, 381; 12 plates. \$7.00.

Twelve lectures delivered between 1910 and 1941 are reprinted with a bibliography of the author's works as a tribute to him on his eighty-second birthday. These are studies in which certain geographical features prompt historical comment, hence the title "Geographical History."

The discussions, which range through ancient geography, history, population, colonization, and modern Aegean matters, are good to have assembled in one accessible volume rather than scattered throughout the periodicals in which they originally appeared. The only revisions claimed (p. v) are the insertion of "some brief references to more recent affairs" (e.g. the Greek annexation of the Dodecanese) and the "omission or curtailment of repeated" or outdated topics (e.g. remarks on "Geographical Teaching," p. 73). References to recent literature appear in the footnotes.

The "Select List" of the author's works includes items for every year (except 1904 and 1918) from 1891 through 1952, and the range of subjects extends from "The Parish Church of Maids Moreton, County of Bucks" to his edition of the Minoan inscriptions from the archives at Knossos.

FROM OTTO TO BEN JONSON

Otto of Freising: The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa. Translated and annotated with an introduction by CHARLES CHRISTOPHER MIEROW with the collaboration of RICHARD EMERY. (*Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies*, No. 49.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1953. Pp. xi, 366. \$5.50.

This is a translation of the account of the first eight years of Frederick's reign as reported by Bishop Otto of Freising and by the bishop's secretary, Rahewin, who wrote the third and fourth books. The editors have provided a substantial fund of supporting information, including numerous citations of Classical parallels and sources.

Ben Jonson of Westminster. By MARC-ETTE CHUTE. New York: E. P. Dutton

& Co., Inc., 1953. Pp. 380. \$5.00.

An attractive biography with frequent attention to the details of Classical learning which are abundantly apparent in Ben Jonson's works. The students of Classical influences will, accordingly, enjoy browsing. This should not be regarded as faint praise, but Miss Chute's work is infinitely more likely to capture and hold the reader's attention than most of her subject's plays.

Classical Influences in Renaissance Literature. By DOUGLAS BUSH. (*Martin Classical Lectures*, No. 13.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952. Pp. 60. \$1.50.

A clear, concise, down-to-earth presentation of about all that could be said well about the topic in two short lectures. The object is very different from that of Miss Chute's book. Her account of a single writer, even in connection with the Classical influences upon him, is enlivened by details with considerable human appeal since she is trying to reach a relatively extensive audience. Mr. Bush, by contrast, was addressing a collegiate audience, presenting it with a pair of lucid introductory lectures into the entire field, stripped of any save the most necessary details and with but little mention of any save the best known personalities of the period.

His account is judicious in that it claims neither too much nor too little for the Renaissance as against the Middle Ages or modern times. For one who knows the story, it is a series of brief reminders about what was accomplished as a result of the increased knowledge of the Classics; for one who knows little of the story, it suggests interesting and important roads of cultural history which may profitably be travelled.

The Septicentennial celebration of the Founding of the Sorbonne College in the University of Paris: Chapel Hill, February, 1953 (Proceedings and Papers). Preface by URBAN T. HOLMES, JR. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, 1953. Pp. ix, 49.

The principal sections of this are "A Brief History of the University of Paris and of the Sorbonne" by René Hardré, "The Spiritual Portrayal of Robert de Sorbonne" by A. L. Gabriel, and "The Library of the Sorbonne in the Fourteenth Century" by Berthold L. Ullman. The latter lecture provides appropriate reading in connection with the lectures by Mr. Bush in that Mr. Ullman illustrates the physical continuity of the Renaissance and the Middle Ages by pre-

senting evidence to show that, certainly for Plato, Propertius and Tibullus, and in likelihood for other authors too, it was MSS from the Sorbonne (often coming down via Amiens or perhaps Corbie from late antiquity) which "were transcribed for Petrarch and other Italian humanists and played a significant part in developing the humanistic interests of the book-hungry scholars of Italy" (p. 44).

TURKICE ET HISPANICE

Izahli Lâtince-Türkçe Sözlük (Bölüm 1). By FARUK ZEKİ PEREK. (*Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları* No. 507, *Klasik Filoloji Enstitüsü* No. 7.) Istanbul: İbrahim Horoz Basimevi, 1952. Pp. xiv, 376.

Probably few readers of the *Classical Journal* will rush to order copies of this but many will feel heartened to know of its existence. This reviewer knows no Turkish but finds, judging from the Latin lemmata, that the book appears to be a respectable equivalent of Charlton T. Lewis' *Elementary Latin Dictionary*. It has about the same number of entries, although there are more cross-references from irregular forms like *allevi*, *auxi*, and *coortus*, and rather more proper names and adjectives. The entries themselves are perceptibly fuller than in Lewis. (Lewis, Smith's *Smaller Latin-English Dict.*, the *Quicherat-Daveluy Dictionnaire* and the *Goelzer-Martel Nouveau Lexique* apparently all lie in the background of this present work.)

The author's letter concerning the review copy is instructive "I enclose herewith the first instalment of my Latin-Turkish Dictionary which is rather an enlarged form of my previous smaller publication. The motive which inspired these books is my belief that without a sound classical education this country will not be able to attain a true understanding of the western mind." Success to him on all scores! And let our Educationists hearken!

Literatura Romana. Por FREDERICO LEO. Traducción castellana directa del alemán . . . por P. U. GONZÁLEZ DE LA CALLE. (*Publicaciones del Instituto Caro y Cuervo*, Ser. Min., 1.) Bogota: 1950. Pp. ix, 292.

This is a Spanish translation of Leo's article "Die Römische Literatur des Altertums" (pp. 401-482) in the third edition of *Die Griechische und Lateinische Literatur und Sprache* by Wilamowitz, Krumbacher, Wackernagel, Leo, Norden, and Skutsch (Leipzig: Teubner, 1912). The text of Leo's

original is rendered paragraph by paragraph, but Professor González has added explanatory footnotes, supplemented the bibliography vastly, and appended indices of ancient names, of modern authorities, and of subjects treated in the bibliography.

The most spectacular difference between the original and the translation is in the bibliography. The original paragraph of histories of literature and handbooks is expanded into some nine pages of similar material; the original one and one-half pages of the bibliographies of individual authors and subjects, has grown into close to fifty pages. The insertions, which turn the volume into a compact bibliographical handbook of sorts are naturally a bit weighted in the direction of French, Italian, and Spanish publications.

The compiler is plagued by ghosts here and there, as on pp. 232-233 where, with reference to the *Aeneid*, "IV canto" is cited as edited "por ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1935)" and the next entry is "*Aeneidos Liber quartus*, ed. with a comm. by A. S. PEASE: Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Pr., 1935." Further, Professor Pease is found three times in the index of authors as "Pease," "Pease, A. S.," and "Stanley Pease, A." If further assurance is needed that the English name is as mysterious to Professor González as Spanish names to most Americans, it should be noted that the authors of the *Index Verborum Ciceronis Epistularum* find themselves alphabetized as "Abbot Oldfather, W.," "Morgan Abbot, Kenneth," and "Vernon Cauter [sic], Howard," although the first and third are elsewhere listed correctly in connection with other publications.

But these are troubles which plague a bibliographer who cannot get his hands on all the volumes he feels obliged to list. Certainly this book, with its supplements by the translator, should aid the cause of Classical studies in Latin America.

ON THE PERIPHERY

Of the first two books noticed here Mr. Russell writes: "Either would be a welcome addition to a high school or college library, not to a Classical library. . . I hope the description makes that sufficiently evident." His description follows:

G. S.

Lands Beyond. By L. SPRAGUE DE CAMP and WILLY LEY. New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc. (1952). Pp. [vii], 329, [17]. 18 illus. in text. \$3.50.

An interesting, popular survey of stories,

and their subsequent influence, about Atlantis (ch. 1), the *Odyssey* (ch. 2), the "Fabulous East" (ch. 3) according to Pliny the Elder and his sources, and such others as Albertus Magnus, Duke Ernest of Swabia, Sir John de Mandeville, and Marco Polo, Sindbad the Sailor (ch. 4), Prester John (ch. 5), the lost tribes of Israel (ch. 6), the quest for *terra australis incognita* (ch. 7), the western ocean (ch. 8) from Plato to Jules Verne and tales of the Sargasso Sea, the Amazons (ch. 9) from the *Iliad* to Matto Grosso, the shape of the earth (ch. 10) according (*alios*) to the Babylonians and Edgar Rice Burroughs' *Pellucidar*, Neupert and the *Hohweltlehre* in the 1920's, and the Lemuria of the Rosicrucians. 6½ pages of bibliography.

The Tree of Human History. By ALAN HOUGHTON BRODRICK. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. Pp. 253. \$4.75.

A brief survey of pre- and proto-historic "cultures" and origins of the Mayans (1-57), Chinese (58-91), India (92-101), Egypt (102-126), Mesopotamia (127-149), Syria and Palestine (150-170), Iran and Asia Minor (171-178), Crete, the Aegean and Greece (179-195), Italy (196-215), non-Mediterranean Europe (216-223), and the "earlier story" from human fossils and artifacts (224-239), followed by a postscript and index. Each of the twelve chapters has three or four pages of bibliography at its close.

HARRIS L. RUSSELL

The University of Texas

Enchanted Island. By WALTER LOWRIE. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. Pp. 191, 200. \$3.00.

Reminiscences of the author's various visits to Ischia. Chapter 5 contains a rather thin report about the island in Classical times (including a summary of the story of Odysseus and Nausicaa in connection with the hoped-for identification of the island with the Homeric Scheria). The Elder Pliny's work is regularly cited as "*Storia Nat.*"

Modern Greek Folktales. Chosen and Translated by R. M. DAWKINS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953. Pp. xxxviii, 491. \$7.00.

Geographically, at least, an even wider sweep into the area of the modern Greek folktale is here taken than in the author's *Forty-five Stories from the Dodekanese* (which will receive more detailed notice in a subsequent issue), for eighty-four traditional stories appear—stories currently

told in many of the villages of Greece or which, before 1923, were being told by the Greeks in Asia Minor. The Greek texts, which are not reprinted, were taken from books and periodicals. While in some instances only a brief outline of the story is given and in others variant versions appear, in general one version is translated in full. Each story is prefaced by a brief introduction which shows the relationships to general European or Near Eastern folktales (usually the latter and rarely any Classical source), outlines the variant forms, and gives considerable information about the literature published concerning the story in question.

G. S.

SIMILE AND METAPHOR

The succession—if it can be called that—of Malenkov to Stalin's mantle—has called forth the usual amount of speculation. It has also called forth the usual comparisons with ancient history. Joseph and Stewart Alsop subheaded their column in *The Washington Post* (Mar. 6, 1953): "Will Stalin's Successor Be A Caligula?" After stating as their belief that Roman history was "probably the free world's best guide to what must be currently happening in the Kremlin," they drew parallels between Malenkov and Caligula and the dark deeds that took place at the beginning of each reign. The conclusion of the two writers is worth quoting:

Nor can one forget the rules that seem to govern the succession of tyrants. Establishers of tyrannies quite often possess a certain beneficence. But an Augustus is succeeded by a Tiberius; Lenin by Stalin; the beneficent tyrant by the tyrant who is cruel, efficient and stern. And as Tiberius was followed by Caligula, so the next heir to the full-blown tyranny tends to be a madman. One wonders whether Stalin's heir will wish the whole world 'had but one neck,' to make decapitation easier.

Perhaps Suetonius has long since been on the Red burn list—but not too long for many to remember what happened to Caligula. One can be silently hopeful in any language.

THE SINS OF OUR YOUTH

From Washington's *Evening Star* (May 14, 1953): "Edwin Cornford, 72, of Napier, New Zealand, waited 30 years to become a lawyer because he failed to take Latin as a schoolboy.

That bar has long since been lowered here.

JFL

BOOK REVIEWS

Homer and the Monuments. By H. L. Lorimer. London: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1950. Pp. xxiii, 552, Pls. 32. \$9.

THE MAIN OBJECTIVE of this excellent volume is to bring together and to "review the archaeological record of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages in the Aegean area, to give as full an account as possible of those elements in it which find a place in the Homeric poems and to relate this survey to that record . . . which is preserved in the poems themselves." To this objective half a century of study and effort has been devoted by the author, and for this she has earned the gratitude of every scholar interested in the Homeric Age of Greece.

The volume is not to be considered either a pioneer or even an early work in Homeric scholarship. Shortly after Schliemann's epoch making discoveries Reichel attempted to bring together archaeological and literary evidence in his *Homerische Waffen* and he was followed by Helbig in a more inclusive work *Das homerische Epos aus den Denkmälern erläutert*. Since the days of those scholars, however, a great quantity of material was brought to light by excavators and Schliemann's discoveries found their proper place in the cultural pattern of the Bronze Age. Often enough scholars used that material for a specific problem, but an inclusive and full survey was sorely needed. Professor M. P. Nilsson's scholarly book *Homer and Mycenae* (1933) proved a welcome and most valuable contribution, but did not lay claim to a full and detailed survey of the material.

To attempt such a survey is not an easy undertaking; for the material, which was unearthed in the various prehistoric sites, is buried again in museum cellars or in a great number of publications almost forgotten by the modern student. Miss Lorimer has succeeded in giving us a well-balanced survey. In an introductory chapter (1-51) she has attempted to sketch a comprehensive picture of prehistoric Greece based on the reports of excavators. This is supplemented by a concise account of the Foreign Relations of Greece in the two ages under consideration with Phoenicia, Syria, Cyprus, and Egypt (52-102). Then follow discussions of such problems as cremation and the use of iron in Homeric times (103-121) writing in the Aegean area and the age of illiteracy in Greece (122-131), arms and armour (132-335), dress (336-405), the Homeric house,

palaces, and temples (406-51) and a succinct discussion of the elements which will make possible the dating of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (452-528). Our author finds that the evidence points out that the *Iliad* "owes its structure to substantial unity of authorship;" that "it seems right . . . to speak of 'the' poet of the *Iliad*;" that the two poems, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, "were complete by 700 or not much later," though the former is the older of the two.

The ground covered is extensive and the material handled is not only vast but permits different interpretations. The few additions and changes suggested here can only help to point out the constant growth of our sources and knowledge of the prehistoric culture of Greece. Miss Lorimer, for example, p. 15, states that "whether it was the Middle Helladic people who produced the culture or regime of the shaft graves—no sufficient evidence exists," and again on p. 30 "the peculiar culture of the shaft graves is found nowhere in Greece." The excavations conducted at Eleusis and Mycenae in 1952 have proved that shaft graves are not limited to the citadel of Mycenae and that they were developed from the Middle Helladic cists. That development is illustrated almost step by step at Eleusis. The graves at that site also illustrate the development of the burial customs of the Mycenaean world which are glossed over by Miss Lorimer. Thus the basic conceptions of what happens after death to the Mycenaean and the Homeric heroes seem to be the same (*AJA*, 52, 1948, 56-81) and they constitute one of the most interesting instances of Bronze Age tradition preserved in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The wealth of gold and other objects found in the shaft graves is said to have been derived from Crete (19-20). Yet Persson and Marinatos have declared for Egypt as its source (F. Persson: *The New Tombs at Dendra*, 164-96); their suggestions are not mentioned. A cult of the dead in Mycenaean times is presented as definite (10 & 15); the existing evidence does not corroborate the statement (cf. Mylonas, "The Cult of the Dead in Helladic Times," *Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson*, 64-105). The chariot representations on the stelai of Mycenae are not necessarily war scenes; they can be interpreted as chariot races held in honor of the dead with greater probability (cf. *AJA*, 55, 1951, 134-47). The earliest case of cremation found in the

mainland of Greece thus far is the one discovered by Blegen in grave XLI of the Heraeum (cf. *Prosymna*, 242) and not those found in the Cerameikos (as p. 459). The palace on the Ano Englianos dates from the closing years of the LH III period, while the tholos tombs found around it belong to LH II (25). I doubt that the cistern of Mycenae is the Perseia of Pausanias, as stated on 33; it seems that the fountain mentioned by Pausanias is the one found by Wace to the West of the Lions' Gate and outside the citadel.

Perhaps to the "exhaustion after an overseas expedition" (36) to which is attributed the fall of Mycenae should be added civil strife which must have resulted from the feud and bloody deeds of Agamemnon-Klytemnestra-Aegisthos-Orestes. In the list of the sanctuaries of Mycenaean times should be added that of Demeter at Eleusis (cf. *AJA*, 1933, 271-86). In the description of the palaces of the Mycenaean world a fuller discussion of the "Fortified Citadels" of LH III should have been included, since they help illustrate the conditions which existed in Troy at the time of the siege. And to the excellent discussion of the chariot the small terracotta chariots of LH III should be added. The belief that the Priene house was "transplanted from Mycenaean Greece to Ionia" (428) is doubtful. It seems to us that it stands at the end of a long evolution of house types beginning with the geometric houses found in the Agora and at Eleusis (the so-called *Hiera Oikia*) and reaching a high point of development at Olynthus. In closing perhaps we should note that Miss Lorimer follows Dörpfeld's identification of Leucas-Ithaca. In so doing she emphasizes the indications favoring this identification but glosses over those in favor of modern Ithaca. Such epithets as "rocky", "rugged", "browsed by goats", and Telemachus' famous statement to Menelaos in *Od.* 4. 598-608, are noted but left without explanation.

These and other details, however, are but minor additions and changes which will not diminish the merit of the book and its great contribution to Homeric Studies. It is to be hoped that an enlarged edition, including the striking results obtained by the excavations of 1952 and 1953 at Mycenae, Pylos, and Eleusis, will soon be forthcoming.

GEORGE E. MYLONAS

Washington University

Principium Sapientiae: The Origins of Greek Philosophical Thought. By F. M. Cornford. [Edited by W. K. C. Guthrie.] New York: Cambridge University Press, 1952. Pp. viii, 271. \$5.00.

CORNFORD did not live to finish this book dealing with a problem which had been of especial interest to him during the whole of his long scholarly life, but many parts of it are finished enough and the general argument is adequately presented. He begins by vigorously questioning what seems to him a tendency to exaggerate the "scientific" quality of early Greek philosophy and then proceeds to try to demonstrate how heavily indebted that philosophy was to religion, mythology, and poetry.

The first section of the book, "Empiricism versus Inspiration," has some highly interesting discussions of the Greeks and the scientific method. Cornford describes how experiments were used by doctors (and members of some other professions) and not by the philosophers, because the doctors were faced with immediate practical problems admitting the use of trial and error, while the philosophers' problems were not of that sort. Especially stressed are the dogmatic, unscientific aspects of Epicureanism, that ancient philosophical system which has had such an appeal for a number of modern scientists and which has so often been thought of as an amazingly scientific philosophy. Although concerned to stress unscientific aspects of Greek philosophical thought (and especially the views and methods of the atomists) and the early philosophers' obligation to poetry, myth, and ritual, Cornford gives on page 187 a fine statement of the difference in nature between Hesiod's view of the past and the picture which Ionian rationalism tried to present.

From his consideration of empiricism among the Greeks, Cornford passes to the doctrine of learning as recollection and the inspiration and intuition of the poet and the seer. In these chapters Plato of course holds the center of the stage. We then move away from Greek materials and to the "shaman," who combines in one person the functions of prophet, poet, and sage. Cornford argues that the philosopher is one differentiated type which developed out of the shaman and illustrates how many of the early Greek philosophers show traces of this origin. The quarrel between the seer and the philosopher is exemplified in the trial and death of Socrates.

Part Two, "Philosophical Cosmogony and Its Origins in Myth and Ritual," opens with an impressive examination of Anaximander's views and then goes on to "consider how it is related to the mythical and poetical tradition of cosmogony which lies behind it." This trail leads first to Hesiod and finally to Babylon. Cornford's theory of

Babylonian influence on Hesiod has been confirmed (as Dodds remarks in a note) by the publication of Hittite-Hurrian materials. To the works cited by Dodds in his note on page 249 might well have been added the convenient essay by H. G. Güterbock, "The Hittite Version of the Hurrian Kumarbi Myths: Oriental Forerunners of Hesiod," *AJA* 52 (1948) 123-134. Ugarit and its traders are suggested as the intermediaries between Babylon and Greece. The MS breaks off before Cornford had finished his exposition or summarized his points. From his notes, Guthrie has produced a useful short *résumé* of the sort of conclusion Cornford might have written.

Cornford's theme in this book is obviously an attractive one. It has been handled with much of Cornford's usual ingenuity; and the material, especially in the earlier chapters, has been set forth with his usual clarity and comeliness of style. His general picture of this dark and fascinating history is too one-sided for complete acceptance, but he has made a good case for the view that other current pictures have also been incomplete.

The book, which concludes with a general index and a short index of Greek words, has the handsome appearance and careful printing one expects of the Cambridge University Press. Unfortunately, the preface (by the editor) is defaced by a footnote containing one of those bibliographical whimsies in which Englishmen seem to excel: "Compare, for example, R. Dussaud, *Les Antécédents Orientaux de la Théogonie d'Hésiode*, Brussels, 1949, vol. 1, pp. 227-31. . . ." One wonders how much time will be wasted by interested students in looking for this apparently voluminous work by Dussaud before they discover (if they all do) that it is a very short article in the ninth volume of *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves*, which is in turn the first volume of *Mélanges Henri Grégoire*.

FREDERICK M. COMBELLACK

University of Oregon

Senilis Amor. Edited and translated by Laurens J. Mills. (*Indiana Univ. Publications, Humanities Series*, No. 27.) Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1952. Pp. v, 167. \$2.50.

PROFESSOR MILLS has commendably rescued the Latin text of *Senilis Amor*, a hitherto unpublished lusty Elizabethan drama, from a MS, not itself a holograph, in the Bodleian Library. He has supplied textual and exegetical commentary, a synopsis of the play, a discussion of authorship, and finally a parallel English rendering. The play, com-

monly attributed to Hausted on the basis of his own *Senile Odium*, remains, as Professor Mills concludes, unattributable, except that it certainly was authored by some university man who knew the *Senile Odium*.

Although the explanatory apparatus is slight, it is serviceable enough, since the stage directions are in themselves clarifying. Some of these directions, together with the entire punctuation scheme, are the work of the editor himself. The large and primary defect of this edition lies in the inadequacy of the handling of the text. The translation swings from contemporary Elizabethan speech — often vigorous and competent — to present-day slang, to unidiomatic transliterations that frequently involve mistranslations and actual misunderstanding of the Latin. Occasionally, too, the editor cavalierly neglects to translate the Latin; at other times he intrudes unwarranted additions. In a brief review it would not be feasible to list all such inaccuracies, misprints, and misinterpretations; but, taken together, they vitiate what might have been a fresh and entertaining addition to dramatic literature.

HARRY E. WEDECK

Brooklyn College

LATIN LAUGHTER

Although their complexion (in the historical sense) may change, old traditions are a long time a-dying. One of them, formerly flourishing in all of our older colleges and universities, is apparently hanging on with some hilarity at Princeton. Last Commencement, according to the *New York Times* (June 21, 1953), a senior delivered the salutatory address in Latin, of which the following are excerpts:

Praeses praestantissime, te salutamus.
Quia depositum tibi creditum custodivisti,***
tibi plaudimus(hic vehementer plaudite).***
Tunc vos, professores doctissimi, salutare volumus. Quamquam nos vexavistis (hic deplorate).*** Deinde vos, decani atque administratores amplissimi, salvere iubemus. Cum puellas pulcherrimas vestras, scilicet stenographas et bibliothecarias, ab nobis celaveritis (hic rideite), ceterum post cenam et a cameris nostris amicas nostras expulistis (hic deplorate).***

But, *O tempora! O mores!* how times have changed! It was deemed necessary even at Princeton to distribute printed copies of the address with an English translation to make sure that the listening graduates would not miss a cue (given in parentheses above)

Etiam nos deprecemur neque rideamus!

JFL

of
r
at
y

s
e
r-
h
k
i-
r-
e
i-
o-
c
f
r
;
d
e
r-
n
n-
r-

-
a
y
d
h
s
r-

e
w
e
r-
h
s
s

e
t
e
t



Pl
adv
In a
post
Be
post
or n
Th
Univ
T
follo

589.

V
ings
ary.

557.

588.

606.

317.

422.

501.

566.

621.

642.

VM.

AMERICAN CLASSICAL LEAGUE SERVICE BUREAU

Please order material at least two weeks in advance of the date on which you want to use it. In an emergency, add 20c for special-handling postage.

Because of the increased cost of fourth-class postage, please add 25c for any order of \$1.50 or more.

The address of the Service Bureau is Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

The Service Bureau has available the following seasonal material:

NEW YEAR'S DAY AND JANUARY

Mimeograph

589. A January Program. 10c

Article

Verbal Magic in New Year's Greetings. *THE CLASSICAL OUTLOOK* for January, 1941. 10c

Mimeographs

FEBRUARY

557. Suggestions for a Program on February 22. 10c
588. Cicero Walks with Washington and Lincoln at Midnight. A short play in English. 15c
606. Roamin' with the Romans. A clever program for club, assembly, "Open House," or radio. 20c

ST. VALENTINE'S DAY

317. Suggestions for a Valentine's Day Program. 5c
422. The Making of Latin Valentines. 20c
501. A Valentine Party by a Vergil Class. 10c
566. The Loves of Jupiter. Directions for making hand puppets, and a play for them. 10c
621. "Cupid and Psyche" in Living Pictures. 4 girls, 2 boys, 15 minutes. 20c
642. Cinderella. An easy Latin playlet in three scenes. 8 minutes. 20c

VALENTINE CARDS

- VM. A picture of a Roman mosaic

showing a Cupid driving a dolphin. Inside the card a Valentine sentiment adapted from an epigram of Martial. Colors, purple and gold. Envelopes to match. Price, 7c per card, 15 for \$1.00.

- VC. A small picture of a Pompeian wall painting depicting Cupids granding grain. Inside the card a Valentine sentiment in Latin. Printed in red. Envelopes to match. Price 5c per card.

CLASSIFIED PRICE LISTS

Classified price lists will be sent free, on request, for teaching material under any of the following topics: Caesar, Cicero, First Year Latin, For the Inexperienced Teacher, Gifts and Awards, Latin Clubs, Latin Games, Miscellaneous, Pictures (Mythology), Pictures (Rome and the Romans), Pictures (Portrait Busts and Statues), Plays in English, Plays in Latin, Projects, Radio and Other Programs, Rome and the Romans, Special Days, Supplementary Reading in Latin and in English, Teaching Methods and Techniques, Value of the Classics, Vergil, Word Study.

The *Classical Journal* takes pleasure in calling attention to the items listed above. Many inquiries received by its Editor might better be directed to the *Service Bureau*.

Advertisers

IN SPITE of the hardships imposed on advertisers, as well as on us, in last year's unfortunate delays and impairment of the appearance of the numbers, the book companies especially have loyally stood by us. We are grateful for this and shall try to atone to them. The income from this source is necessary to us. Mr. Abel would welcome any suggestion of new contacts; after last year his is not a bed of roses. Of course it helps if you mention the *Journal* in ordering books and supplies.

TUTOR THAT NEVER TIRES, INC.

BRONXVILLE 8, NEW YORK

Complete stories of **USING LATIN, BOOK ONE**, linguistically arranged by Dr. Waldo E. Sweet, Director of the Latin Workshop, Program of Linguistics, University of Michigan, **on 35 mm. filmstrips.**

Special arrangement with **SCOTT, FORESMAN & COMPANY.**

Filmstrip	Lessons	Filmstrip	Lessons
No. 1	1-9	No. 8	55-61
No. 2	10-18	No. 9	62-66
No. 3	19-26	No. 10	67-72
No. 4	27-33	No. 11	73-78
No. 5	34-40	No. 12	79-83
No. 6	41-47	No. 13	84-88
No. 7	48-54	No. 14	89-95

Price, complete set of fourteen, complete with manual \$40.00

Individual filmstrips at \$3.00 each

Teacher's Manual of Instruction \$1.00

Latin Week Committee

MISS DONNIS MARTIN, *Chairman*
Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S. C.

PROFESSOR CLYDE MURLEY
Northwestern University

MISS LUCY A. WHITSEL
Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va.

MISS JESSIE HELEN BRANAM
Sr. H. S., Trenton, Mo.

MRS. MATTIE JOYCE BLACKWELL
Spartanburg H. S., S. C.

Committee on Educational Policies

PROFESSOR GRAYDON W. REGENOS, *Chairman*
Tulane University, New Orleans 18, La.

PROFESSOR JAMES E. DUNLAP
University of Michigan

MISS ESTHER WEIGHTMAN
Wisconsin H. S., Madison, Wis.

MISS GERTRUDE J. OPPELT
South Side H. S., Ft. Wayne, Ind.

PROFESSOR L. R. LIND
University of Kansas, Lawrence

Officers of the Southern Section

President
GLADYS LAIRD

P. K. Younge Laboratory School
University of Florida

Secretary-Treasurer
ARTHUR F. STOCKER
University of Virginia

Vice-President
J. W. D. SKILES

University of Kentucky

Member of Executive Committee
DONNIS MARTIN
Winthrop College

Delegate to the Southern Humanities Conference
ARTHUR H. MOSER, University of Tennessee

